

Anglican Theological Review



EDITED BY

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER and LEICESTER C. LEWIS

Professors in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

In Collaboration with Representative Scholars
throughout the Church

VOLUME II

MAY, 1919

NUMBER I

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| The Alleged Persecutions of Christians by Domitian ... <i>Elmer T. Merrill</i> | I |
| A Critique of <i>Matthew's Sayings of Jesus</i> by Castor ... <i>Frederick C. Grant</i> | 27 |
| The Monastery of St. Honoratius on the Island of Lerins <i>Edwin S. Lane</i> | 35 |
| Old Testament Bibliography (Continued) <i>Howard C. Ackerman</i> | 43 |
| Critical Note Reconceptualization as a Principle of Exegesis (<i>H.</i> <i>C. Ackerman</i>) | 71 |
| Reviews | 74 |
| Notes and Comments | 85 |

PUBLISHED BY

Columbia University Press

LANCASTER, PA.

AND

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Anglican Theological Review

VOLUME II

MAY, 1919

NUMBER I

ADVISERS

VERY REV. WM. C. DEWITT, D.D., Dean of Western Theological Seminary

VERY REV. HUGHELL E. W. FOSBROKE, D.D., Dean of General Theological Seminary

REV. WILLIAM T. MANNING, D.D., D.C.L., Rector of Trinity Church, New York

REV. HARVEY OFFICER, Order of the Holy Cross

EDITORIAL BOARD

HONORARY COOPERATING EDITORS

REV. PROFESSOR LORING W. BATTEN, D.D., Ph.D., General Theological Seminary

REV. PROFESSOR F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D., Union Theological Seminary

REV. PROFESSOR FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D., General Theological Seminary

RT. REV. WILLIAM WALTER WEBB, D.D., Bishop of Milwaukee

REV. ELWOOD WORCESTER, D.D., Ph.D., Emmanuel Church, Boston

DEPARTMENTAL EDITORS

REV. LESTER BRADNER, Ph.D., General Board of Religious Education (Religious Education)

REV. PROFESSOR BURTON S. EASTON, D.D., Ph.D., Western Theological Seminary (New Testament)

REV. PROFESSOR ARTHUR W. JENKS, D.D., General Theological Seminary (Anglican Church History)

REV. PROFESSOR LEICESTER C. LEWIS, M.A., B.D., Western Theological Seminary (Church History)

REV. PROFESSOR SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, D.D., Ph.D., Western Theological Seminary (Old Testament)

PROFESSOR ROBERT M. WENLEY, Sc.D., D.C.L., LL.D., University of Michigan (Apologetics)

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

REV. PROFESSOR HOWARD C. ACKERMAN, M.A., B.D., Nashotah House (Old Testament)

REV. PROFESSOR THEODORE B. FOSTER, B.A., Western Theological Seminary (Dogmatics)

REV. FREDERICK C. GRANT, S.T.M., St. Luke's, Evanston (New Testament)

REV. ROBERT F. LAU, D.D., St. John's, Bayonne (Liturgics)

REV. JOHN A. MAYNARD, D.D., Ph.D., Holy Trinity Church (St. James' Parish), New York (History of Religions)

PROFESSOR VIDA D. SCUDDER, M.A., Wellesley College (Ethics)

REV. PROFESSOR WALTER F. WHITMAN, B.A., B.D., Bexley Hall (Church History)

All editorial communications should be addressed to the editors at 2720 Washington Blvd., Chicago, Ill., U. S. A.

The REVIEW is published four times a year, in May, October, December, and March by the Columbia University Press, a corporation. The officers of the Press are Nicholas Murray Butler, president; Wm. H. Carpenter, secretary; and John B. Pine, treasurer. Subscription price, \$4.00 annually. Single numbers, \$1.00. Subscriptions and all business communications should be addressed to the publishers, Columbia University Press, 41 North Queen Street, LANCASTER, PA., or Columbia University, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

Entered as second-class matter, December 5, 1918, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1919, by Columbia University Press



Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER and LEICESTER C. LEWIS

Professors in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

In Collaboration with Representative Scholars
throughout the Church

VOLUME II

MAY, 1919

NUMBER I

THE ALLEGED PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS BY DOMITIAN

By ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL, *The University of Chicago*

The emperor Domitian does not appear to have been by any means a notable exponent and exemplar of personal morality, but he was a staunch champion of orthodoxy. His especial interest in the upholding and upbuilding of the established faith, so far at least as its external observances were concerned, is exposed, however, to some suspicion of admixture of a personal element. The exaltation of the reigning Augustus as a present deity was his particular passion. What is called emperor-worship had been carried on in varying degree in different quarters of the empire for a century or so, but for the most part the reigning monarchs had looked upon it with tolerance rather than with active and fostering approbation. It was an expression of civic loyalty centering around a natural concrete object. For some reason or reasons that need not be discussed here, Domitian appears to have been disposed to promote it by every insistence at his command. He may have been touched by that megalomania which in the case of Caligula had amounted to a real insanity. It is impossible to decide on this point with confidence, as the extant records of his life are so scanty and otherwise unsatisfactory. In his zeal for orthodoxy he revived the antiquated horror of entombing alive a Chief Vestal who was charged with breaking her vow

of chastity, and he compelled to suicide other Vestals, while their paramours were flogged to death in accordance with ancient precedent.¹ In his jealousy for his personal and official prerogative, and his fear of conspiracy aimed at his life, he terrorized the senate, and brought to destruction so many of its leading members, that the latter part of his reign is spoken of by his surviving contemporaries as an orgy of bloodshed. He executed his own cousin, Flavius Sabinus, because the herald in announcing his election made a slip of the tongue, and hailed him not "consul" but "imperator."² What happened to the herald we are not told. Another cousin, Flavius Clemens, brother of Sabinus, was also a victim. His case is of especial interest as the peg on which hangs the present investigation. It is known to us, so far as it can be said to be known, through the two extant historians of Domitian's reign, Suetonius and Cassius Dio, both being pagans.

Suetonius, a contemporary witness, in all probability resident in Rome at the time, and apparently on terms of friendly acquaintance, so far as that was possible for a young man, with Romans of high station, tells us very briefly:

"Later [Domitian] suddenly put to death on the merest suspicion and almost in his very consulship his own cousin, Flavius Clemens, a man looked down upon for his lack of energy."³

It is hard to say just what *inertia* means here. It may be that "lack of energy" or "lack of activity," or "want of reasonable ambition," corresponds to the idea; or it may mean "absence of interest in public affairs," or only "leading a retired life."

Suetonius had just been describing Domitian's fear of death by conspiracy and assassination. The clear intimation is that this is the reason why he brought about the death of Clemens, whom he had just honored by raising him to the

¹Cf. Suet. *Dom.* 8; Plin. *Ep.* IV. 11.

²Suet. *Dom.* 10.

³Suet. *Dom.* 15.

consulship as his own colleague in the office (95 A.D.), and whose two sons he had virtually adopted as heirs to his throne. He suddenly became suspicious that Clemens was unwilling to await longer the time when one or both of his sons should wear the crown, and was plotting against his imperial cousin's life. Suetonius characterizes Clemens as *contemptissimae inertiae* doubtless merely to accentuate the improbability of the suspicion: Clemens was not a person who had ever shown the least disposition to push himself in any way; his pronounced lack of that interest in public matters which would befit a person of his family and social connections had exposed him to much unfavorable and even contemptuous comment; it was quite impossible for such a man to be a secret conspirator; he was surely innocent.

Suetonius does not say by what means the death of Clemens was compassed. It must have been, of course, through the form of a trial before an obsequious senate, ready to register the will of the emperor without regard to such irrelevant matters as sufficient evidence of guilt on the part of the accused. Such men as Tacitus and Pliny sat in that senate, and shared in its many votes of predetermined condemnation; and neither the remorseful *peccaui* of the one, eloquently phrased after the tyrant's death had made it safe to repent, nor the bitter reminiscences of the other, can help the modern reader to pardon all through understanding all.

It is by no means necessary to suppose that the actual charge under which Clemens suffered was that of plotting assassination. In that case other persons would surely have been involved, and the series of cases would have been so imposing as to have left a definite trace in the record of even so brief a reporter as Suetonius. He indicates what he conceived to be the real reason for the condemnation of Clemens; he does not state the form of the legal charge against him. If the emperor had only an unfounded suspicion to go upon, he would naturally seek for an accusation in support of which some sort of plausible evidence could be trumped up. With

the formal means by which the ruin of the innocent victim was brought about, Suetonius does not trouble himself: the fact gives him an opportunity to conclude his paragraph with the Roman comment on the ineluctable irony of fate:

"By this very deed he especially hurried on his own destruction."

Yet, singularly enough, Suetonius does not proceed to show how this cruel act, by which Domitian thought to assure his life, was the very cause that brought him to his end. Only some distance farther on do we find a statement which, by the help of interpretation from another source, furnishes the true key to the remark which would otherwise remain somewhat enigmatic. In mentioning the final and successful conspiracy against Domitian's life Suetonius says:

"Stephanus, a steward of Domitilla, himself at the time under charges of keeping back funds, offered his advice and assistance."⁴

It was this Stephanus who encouraged the hesitant conspirators, possibly arranged the plans, certainly struck the first blow with his own dagger. But Suetonius has said not a word to indicate who this Domitilla was, who had a *procurator* or steward (doubtless, from his office, a freedman—Dio and Philostratus definitely call him so) named Stephanus. Flauia Domitilla was the name, according to Suetonius, of both the mother and the sister of Domitian, but these persons had both been dead for more than a quarter of a century.⁵ Evidently neither of them could be the Domitilla referred to here, and they are the only other bearers of that name mentioned by Suetonius. His account is inexcusably defective in this matter. We must take refuge in the narrative written a century or so later by Cassius Dio. Here again we are confronted by a difficulty. Almost all of the part of Dio's history that describes the reign of Domitian is extant only in the abridgment made by Xiphilinus, a Christian monk of the eleventh century. And Suetonius and Dio are the only extant historians (if Suetonius may, for the sake of

⁴Suet. *Dom.* 17.

⁵Suet. *Dom.* 3.

courtesy, be called a historian) of Domitian's reign. But in the lack of the full original, the studious Xiphilinus must be trusted. He says:

"In the same year [95 A.D.] Domitian slaughtered many others, including the consul, Flavius Clemens, though Clemens was his own cousin, and had to wife Flauia Domitilla, herself also a kinswoman of his. Against them both was brought the charge of 'atheism,' for which also many others were condemned who had drifted into the practices of the Jews. Of these some were put to death, others deprived of their property; Domitilla was only banished to Pandateria. And he also put to death Glabrio, who had been consul with Trajan [91 A.D.], on the usual stock charges, and because he had fought with wild beasts. For Domitian was especially incensed against him through jealousy on this account, in that he had summoned Glabrio while yet consul to his Alban country-seat to attend the so-called *Iuuenalia*, and had set him to slay an immense lion, which feat he accomplished not only without suffering any injury, but despatching his adversary in most workmanlike fashion."⁶

Before proceeding to the further ransacking of this passage from Dio we may trim up the shreds that Suetonius left hanging. Here is a third Flauia Domitilla, wife of Flavius Clemens, and kinswoman of the emperor, presumably from name and probable age his niece,⁷ the daughter of his sister of the same name, who had died before Vespasian, their father, reached the throne. Stephanus was evidently the steward of this third Domitilla, and his indignation and grief at the fate of his master and mistress, joined perhaps with fears for his own safety (he was probably trying loyally in Domitilla's behalf to secrete from confiscation some part of her and her husband's property), led him to take a leading part in the slaying of the titled assassin. Thus fate turned Domitian's bloodstained hand against himself.

Dio and Suetonius complement each the other in the matter of Clemens. Suetonius assigns what appears to him to be the real underlying reason for the execution of Clemens, but says nothing of the specific charge on which he was condemned: Dio (or perhaps only Xiphilinus) does not attempt to penetrate below the surface, but says that the charge

⁶ Cass. Dio LXVII. 14.

⁷ Quintilian also indicates this relationship, when he says (*Inst.* IV. pr. 2), *cum uero mihi Domitianus Augustus sororis suae nepotum delegauerit curam.*

against him and Domitilla and many others was "atheism," with the implication that the two named persons, like the "many others" mentioned in immediate connection, had incurred the charge by adopting Jewish practices. It is of course not clear whether they were supposed to be full proselytes to the Jewish religion, or only numbered among those "devout men" who were not entirely committed to the keeping of the complete Mosaic law. Very likely most of the Romans of any social station resident in the capital knew nothing and cared less about any such distinction. But could a charge of "atheism" hold against Jews or Jewish proselytes or quasi-proselytes?

Certainly not in strict legality, or at least under established precedents, against Jews. The Jewish religion had been, up to the destruction of the last vestiges of the Palestinian kingdom by Titus, a *religio licita*, as the official religion of an allied state. It could therefore be freely practiced by any Jew, and the Roman authority had not in fact troubled itself about the question whether a Roman or Latin citizen was permitted to be or to become a Jew in religion. Even after the destruction of the Jewish state the same toleration was continued, though it had now lost its former basis in theory. The Jew might still plead the customs of his fathers as explaining why he did not share in the worship of the Romans. As regards a Roman or Latin citizen, the State did not care how many or what gods he worshipped; but on the other hand the State had never said (except apparently in the case of the Jews by blood as well as religion, many of whom were Roman or Latin citizens) that he might effectively plead his favorite exotic religion as ground for excuse from the common obligations of citizenship. The emperor-worship was gradually coming to be regarded as a test of loyalty in citizenship, and the natural Roman mind—still more the official Roman mind—could not conceive that such a purely conscientious conviction on the part of any sectary could possibly exist as would inhibit him, if he were indeed a loyal

citizen and a Roman, from invoking the emperor's *Genius*, or from dropping a few grains of incense on a fire burning in a tripod-bowl before his statue. If the citizen refused such a test of loyalty, especially if it was demanded of him by competent legal authority (and it was for the magistrate himself to decide that point), or if he notoriously absented himself from such popular loyal demonstrations as involved this ceremonial, he appears to have been theoretically exposed to a charge of constructive treason, disloyal irreverence, "atheism." Fortunately the Romans were not much devoted to carrying into practice legal theories, however logically deduced, that were without precedent in actual history. They were tolerant by nature, not purely legalistic by temper, and fonder of observing precedents in administration than of creating them. Therefore there is known to have been little trouble up to Domitian's time on the score of religious nonconformity.

But Domitian appears to have been an apostle of conformity. He did not, so far as we know, molest the Jews who were Jews by race, except by increasing the strictness with which they were watched, and by enforcing more rigorously the financial exactions to which they were legally liable; but it is conceivable that he was fretted by their "special privileges," and that he meant to put deterrent pressure at least upon such prominent Roman citizens as were inclined to "drift into Jewish practices." They must at any rate conform. If they wished over and above their due civic conformity to add the worship of any other deities, that (I imagine he would say) was their own business and none of his. Domitian's theories about conformity do not appear to have been essentially different from those of educated Romans in general; he seems merely to have been disposed to be more urgent about enforcing conformity than were his predecessors on the throne and most of his successors. He might have pushed the matter still farther, if he had lived longer. As it is, we may be justified in guessing that these processes of

the last few months of his reign were the only ones of the sort that he carried out. It was to the Roman mind of course a purely political measure of administration, not a religious one.

Suetonius furnishes not a hint of any prosecutions by Domitian based on charges of "atheism." He speaks of Glabrio as put to death in exile on suspicion of conspiracy to rebellion.⁸ The connection in which Dio mentions the condemnation of Glabrio might appear to indicate that among "the usual stock charges" against him was that of "atheism"; for Dio appears to separate these cases of "atheism" from the many others purely political that involved members of "the Stoic opposition," and Glabrio's case is noted immediately after those of the former group. Yet the contemporary Suetonius could hardly have been in error about the fact that Glabrio was in exile at the time of his death-sentence, and a charge of "atheism" would hardly seem likely under those circumstances, unless indeed it were the revamping of an old indictment. That is certainly not incredible.

With regard to all these cases where different charges against the same defendant are specified by different writers, the student of Roman antiquity will remember that the Romans had no strict law of evidence, and enforced no rigid confinement of the prosecution to the specific charges alleged in the indictment, or in what corresponded to that document. On the contrary, Roman legal procedure genially allowed the prosecution to range over the whole past life of the defendant, and to bring forward, with or without evidence, anything and everything that could tend to incriminate his general character in the minds of the jurors; and in cases against senators the senate sat as a jury.

The Jews were popularly charged by their opponents with "atheism," both in the religious and in the political sense of the word; in the former sense, because they erected

⁸ Suet. Dom. 10 *quasi molitor rerum nouarum*.

no temples to their deity in addition to the one at Jerusalem, and did not represent him even there by any graven image; in the latter, because they would not join in the popular rites of the Romans, and especially in emperor-worship, considering it of course the rankest idolatry.⁹ To the emperor who required himself to be always addressed in speech or writing as *Dominus et Deus Noster*,¹⁰ this must have been a most flagrant and disloyal insult to his manifest divinity. It is quite conceivable that among the senators who were hostile to Domitian there may have been many who betrayed an aversion to his overweening pretensions to godhead, and among the miscellaneous charges that Roman procedure allowed to be alleged against defendants who were brought to book, that of "Jewish atheism" would in their cases be one of the most available, and one of the easiest to substantiate from their past demeanor, when no other conclusive evidence was demanded.

Neither Suetonius nor other contemporaries like Tacitus and Pliny, who furnish us with vivid glimpses of the Terror, afford any hint of charges of that religious nonconformity which was apparently viewed by Domitian (as by the Roman magistrates in the second half of the following century) as a form of constructive high-treason. The contemporaries treat all the cases of the Terror as political, since in essence they notoriously were so. But there appears to be no reason to suspect that Dio is wrong in his intimation that among the specific charges of "the usual stock" sort in many such cases was that of "Jewish atheism." It evidently does not of necessity follow that in all of the cases thus designated by Dio the defendants actually were Judaizers in religion—only that their reserved attitude toward Domitian's arrogant claims to divinity laid them open to such a charge. Of course there may have been actual Judaizers among them, but it is unsafe to affirm this on the basis of Dio's account.

⁹ Cf., e.g., Tac. *Hist.* V. 5, and the citations given by J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire Romain*, I, pp. 45ff.

¹⁰ Suet. *Dom.* 13.

It should be further observed that neither in Suetonius, nor in Dio, nor in any other of the pagan writers who touch upon the subject, is there the slightest intimation that Domitian's bloody jealousy was directed against any but the leading aristocrats whom he supposed he had reason to fear, or that it ravaged at all outside the narrow circle of the Court and the Parliament. There is no indication of its extension into the provinces, or among the commonalty even in Rome. And if there had been such extension, it is altogether probable that some echo of it would be heard. There is absolute silence.

Thus stands the complete case so far as all contemporary evidence goes, and all pagan evidence, whether contemporary or (in the case of Dio) derived from now unknown sources. (The alleged testimony of a certain pagan "Bruttius" will be considered later.)

But Christian writers have a somewhat different story to tell. As a preliminary, however, to the examination of it, two words of warning must be uttered.

The first is so simple and self-evident that it would hardly seem necessary to state it, were it not for the oft-recurring observation made by the student of profane history that writers on early church history sometimes appear inclined to a lamentable disregard of proper and rational canons of historical evidence. The warning is, that no repetition of a professed historical statement down through a succession of writers produces the slightest increment in its evidential value, if each successive writer had apparently nothing but the statement of his predecessor or predecessors on which to found his own: on the contrary, such accounts, especially (I regret to say) in the case of early ecclesiastical writers, tend in the course of frequent repetition to accumulate about themselves accretions of amiable and pious imagination that too frequently have imposed upon eager credulity as of equal authority with the original nuclear statement, and the whole conglomeration has been accepted as truth—and this.

even when the foundation on which all this superstructure of romance has been erected may well have been only a guess or an unwarrantable inference. This phenomenon is of course due to the extreme interest that zealous students take and have taken in piecing together early church history, and to their perfectly human reluctance to discard, but on the contrary their eagerness to magnify and adorn, any possible fragment, when so little has been preserved from the times concerned, and (in modern days) destructive criticism seems continually to be making that little less. As an example of an expanding body of mere repetitions, I have pointed out elsewhere¹¹ that for a whole millennium after Eusebius every single statement by Christian writers (fortunately in this case not complicated by pious accretions) about the persecution of Christians in Bithynia under Pliny dates back to Eusebius alone, while his account depends solely on that of Tertullian. This is a pertinent example of the occasional evidential value of what is sometimes called "a unanimous and unbroken Christian tradition." The many witnesses are reducible to just one, and that one not contemporary with the events, but relying upon a yet earlier person's report of them, and apparently misunderstanding that in certain details.

The second warning is concerned with something quite as important, but not so obviously an incontestable postulate. A recent and learned writer on the earliest days of Christianity speaks regretfully of the loss of the first-century "archives" of the Church in Rome, which have unfortunately "perished by fire or other accident." It apparently seems to him (and I suspect most writers on the subject would agree with him) perfectly self-evident that there must have existed such "archives" in the infant days of the Roman Church. He is quite as certain of it (though there is no evidence of such a thing) as I should be that any old-fashioned New

¹¹*Zur frühen Überlieferungsgeschichte des Briefwechsels zwischen Plinius und Trajan*, in *Wiener Studien*, XXXI, 250ff.

England debating society would at the very beginning of its organization buy a record-book and start in to keep minutes of its meetings. We do not well to translate our modern imitative habits, and our eager interest in the local history of the ancient churches, and our appreciation of the importance of the subject, into a belief that those primitive Christians must have felt (because it is such a pity if they did not) just as we do about such matters of possible record. Even in these enlightened days, after a tradition of centuries of canons and episcopal and archidiaconal visitations, and suchlike gentle compulsions, I have known parishes where the importance of keeping up the registers was quite unknown or ignored. In the infancy of the Christian churches it is altogether probable that it was never felt. The early days of a first-century Church, composed chiefly of those not wise or mighty after the flesh, struggling for existence, sometimes persecuted, always despised, are not the days for the creation or development of an interest in local church history, or of an appreciation of its future value and importance. There is no justification for the presumption (in the lack of evidence) that the local churches for the first hundred years or so had any "archives" that included records of their life and adventures. All the presumption is in the negative direction.

Nor can it rationally be supposed that oral tradition over a long period supplied the place of such historical "archives." The local churches appear to have had all they could do to keep alive a much more important tradition, that of essential faith and order. To this they devoted their attention. Not until the middle of the second century of the Christian era does interest in the past history of the local churches, and an attempt to reconstruct it, appear to emerge—at about the same time that in the West (the East seems to have met the dawn somewhat earlier) the ruling episcopate also emerges. The two events may have had—probably did have—some organic connection. To argue out fully the question of the alleged absence of historical records and of

genuine and unsupported oral historical tradition in the Roman Church up to the middle of the second century, would take too much space in this article. A single parting suggestion may be adventured: if the Roman Church had possessed up to the middle of the second century such historical "archives," or such unwritten but genuine and accurate historical traditions, as has been popularly supposed, is it conceivable that in the second half of the same century such a mass of fantastic and impossible and now universally discredited and discarded stories could have been set afloat with any chance of gaining credence as we see exemplified in the Petrine and Clementine romances, to mention no others? or that there could have been such apparent doubt and known variations in the account of the early episcopal succession in Rome as we find at that time and later, even (according to St. Jerome)¹² in the Roman Church itself?

With these two warnings, then—(1) that a statement does not become more trustworthy by mere repetition, and (2) that there is no reason for assuming that assertions widely separated in time from the events, and dubitable by nature or circumstance, were probably founded, if not on "archives," at least on a genuine oral tradition handed down from the times concerned,—we may proceed to examine the Christian testimony on the reign of Domitian.

Those students who have convinced themselves that the Apocalypse of St. John furnishes actual evidence of a persecution of Christians by Domitian are wont to base their certainty, first, on the definite ascription of the work to the last part of Domitian's reign, and then, on the interpretation of certain specific passages, such as *Rev.* 2. 13; 6.9; 12.11; 17.6; 20.4. Into the troubled questions about the authorship, date, source, structure, circumstances, and interpretation of this mystical work, I certainly cannot enter here. But assuming the disputed points to stand in general as these advocates would have them, I would yet indicate certain

¹² *De Vir. Ill.* 15.

considerations that appear only rational. The first is, that fervid and enthusiastic apocalyptic utterances are in general very unsafe primary bases on which to rest assertions of cold historical facts, particularly regarding a contested thesis; they are especially so when such value as they may have depends not merely on the correctness of the interpretation of them, but also on the preliminary determination of other fundamental and yet contested questions regarding the document of which they form a part. The second consideration is, that organized and systematic persecutions, legal in form and carried out by public judicial authority, are one thing, while more or less isolated, individual, and sporadic cases of suffering for righteousness' sake are quite another. It is not supposed or claimed by any one, ancient or modern, that persecutions in the first and proper sense took place under more than a specified few of the Roman emperors; it might well be supposed that persecutions in the limited second sense were taking place now and then, here and there, in every reign and in every quarter of the Roman world, beginning, indeed, at Jerusalem in the very earliest years of the Church. And as regards the cited passages from the Book of Revelation, it should be noted that (interpreted as historical allusions and not as prophetic utterances) they do not profess or appear to pertain, any or all of them, necessarily to the present or the immediate past, but only to the indefinite past, extending possibly over quite a long period; and furthermore, they are perfectly explicable as referring to such individual cases as do not presume any organized, systematic, legal action. The Book of Revelation certainly ought not to be cited as furnishing historical evidence, whether primary or corroborative, of such a persecution of Christians by Domitian as is usually meant by that term, among ancients and moderns alike.

In the first sentence (after the salutation) of the letter of the Roman Church to the Corinthian, commonly called "First Clement," the scribe says:

"Through unexpected and repeated troubles and hindrances of our own we have been too long (in our judgment) delayed in turning our attention to the matters in dispute among you," etc.

That appears to me an accurate translation of the Greek, reading *περιστάσεις* (with the Constantinople MS.), and interpreting it by *impedimenta* of the ancient Latin version. On the passage I can do no better than to repeat what I have briefly said elsewhere.¹³ The language does not suggest to an unprejudiced eye that anything very terrible has shaken the Roman Church. It sounds curiously like an apologetic introduction to a modern letter—"I really meant to write you long ago, but all sorts of bothering things have interfered." Yet critics almost or quite unanimously have agreed that the words quoted have definite and unmistakable reference to a terrible persecution through which the Church at Rome has just been passing. As the accredited list of persecutors includes from the first century only Nero and Domitian, the assaults of one or the other of these are believed to be meant. Earlier critics were sometimes disposed to decide for Nero; later men, seeing the impossibility of dating the letter so far back, but being under the same formidable preoccupation of mind resulting from the felt necessity of somehow identifying the scribe of this letter with the Clement of Hermas and Clement the bishop, and anxious to gain every possible support for that position, have insisted with substantial unanimity that Domitian's persecution was plainly the one in mind. Of course these critics, starting with their presumption, would not be satisfied with such an obvious and simple rendering of the phrase as I have given above. Like their ancient prototypes they are disposed to color the dull picture up a bit. The latest translator give us "misfortunes and calamities"; but *περιπτώσεις*, which he would prefer in place of *περιστάσεις*, appears hardly to be susceptible of such a strong meaning. It is rather merely "accidents." Moreover, these critics have

¹³ "On 'Clement of Rome,'" in the *American Journal of Theology*, XXII, pp. 440f.

not succeeded in explaining satisfactorily why the writer uses such vague phraseology, if he is talking about a Domitianic persecution lately suffered, when his later pages show that he can speak plainly enough about *θλίψεις* from without. It is absurd to say that he was afraid of Domitian, who was yet living. Nor do they explain how *ἐπαλλήλους* naturally fits the notion of a persecution at all.

I have also pointed out in the article from which I have just quoted, that the letter in question cannot possibly be assigned to the last months of Domitian's reign, or to a period immediately thereafter. Accordingly it is quite preposterous to claim that the innocent sentence with which it starts bears conscious witness to a persecution of the Church in Rome by Domitian.

We may therefore pass on at once to the definite statement of Melito, made about 170 A.D., and preserved only in Eusebius. Melito is quoted by him as asserting to Marcus Aurelius that the Church had, together with the realm, enjoyed unbroken prosperity under all the emperors except Nero and Domitian:

"Nero and Domitian alone, misled by certain malicious persons, showed a disposition to bring false accusations against the doctrine that we hold."¹⁴

This, three quarters of a century after the event, is the earliest extant mention of Domitian as a persecutor of Christians. The bishop of Sardis could hardly have been ignorant of occasional sufferings of Christians at other times; it is reasonable to suppose, therefore, that he has reference to systematic and formal persecutions. But whence did he derive his information about Domitian? In the lack of known literary source for the statement, it might seem natural to suppose that the Church had preserved and handed down an oral tradition to that effect. But besides the general warning already given about the too ready assumption of the existence of such genuine though unwritten historical traditions, it may be remarked that Melito's statement af-

¹⁴Eus. *H. E.* IV. 26 (190).

fords a bit of definite and specific illustration of ground for the belief that such unsupported traditions did not in general exist in the first century of the Church. The churches in Bithynia were quite near neighbors of that over which Melito presided, and while he was perhaps himself already living as a child or youth, they had suffered a persecution, under Trajan, which, though happily of short duration and not marked by wanton savagery, yet in its character as a series of legal processes, and perhaps even in the number of victims—certainly (if we can trust Pliny's report)¹⁵ in the effect of temporary suppression of Christian influence on the local communities—was directly comparable with the persecution at Rome under Nero. It hardly seems likely that the bishop of Sardis would have overlooked or have wilfully omitted from mention the Bithynian persecution, if he had known that there had ever been such a thing. The only reasonable inference is that he did not know anything of it, which means that no report of such a striking episode in Christian history as that in several respects was, had found a place in the "archives" of his not very far distant church, and no oral tradition thereof had been so perpetuated as to have reached his ear. That is a significant fact to notice for its bearing upon the question of oral historical traditions in the earliest Church.

To the question of the possible or probable source of Melito's statement about Domitian I shall recur later. The next Christian witness to be cited is Hegesippus, who was substantially a (younger?) contemporary of Melito. Here again we have to depend on a quotation preserved in Eusebius,¹⁶ according to which Domitian, being assured of the purely spiritual character of Christ's expected kingdom by his personal examination of two grandsons of Jude, "the Lord's brother," stopped by edict the persecution of the Church. Hegesippus, then, apparently had spoken of Dom-

¹⁵ Plin. *Ep.* X. 96. 10.

¹⁶ Eus. *H. E.* III. 20 (110).

tian as a persecutor. What his source was for the story—probably mythical—of the interview with the kinsmen of Our Lord, we cannot tell. But Tertullian, a quarter of a century later, mentions both Nero and Domitian as persecutors, telling us that

"Domitian had begun the same thing [as Nero], but being also a man, readily gave up his undertaking, and restored those whom he had banished."¹⁷

Tertullian's source also is unknown, but there is a flavor in his statement of both Melito and Hegesippus. Tertullian's *templauerat* suggests Melito's *ἠθέλησαν*; the statement that the persecution was brief appears to agree with both writers; while the ascription of the change of policy to a humane feeling might well have come from Hegesippus, as others (I think) have noted. It will be remarked that the translator who put Tertullian's Latin into Greek for the use of Eusebius, rendered the African writer's *sed qua et homo* by *ἀλλ' οἶμαι ἄτε ἔχων τι συνέσεως*, which may be a correct interpretation. But Tertullian's statement that Domitian himself recalled the exiles, though possibly a faithful report of his source, is certainly wrong in fact, and is corrected in Eusebius.¹⁸

That is as far as Christian tradition appears to have gone up to the end of the second century about Domitian as a persecutor. From Tertullian onward, in the numerical list of persecutors that came to be traditional among Christian writers, Nero and Domitian consistently occupy the first and second places respectively. But by the time of Eusebius, a century or more later (and perhaps considerably earlier

¹⁷ Tert. *Apol.* 5.

¹⁸ Could Tertullian have got this notion from a careless reading or a faulty memory of Plin. *Ep.* 1. 5, or perhaps from other of the *Letters* also where certain of the exiles are mentioned as back in Rome? He was a good deal of a blunderer, and the thing is not impossible. He was acquainted at first or second hand with the correspondence of Pliny and Trajan about the persecution in Bithynia, and might perhaps have read the other *Letters*. He certainly had read Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars*, and appears to have got from that work his only information (outside of the mention in Melito), entirely lacking in detail, of the persecution by Nero.

than Eusebius), a definite link had been discovered or created that connected Christianity with the aristocratic Terror under Domitian.

Eusebius tells us¹⁹ that the doctrine of the faith so far prevailed [under the Flavians] that even non-Christian historians have not hesitated to record the persecution [by Domitian] and the martyrdoms connected with it, narrating that along with very many others Flavia Domitilla, whose mother was the sister of Flavius Clemens,²⁰ one of the consuls of Rome at the time, was banished on account of her witness for Christ. In his *Chronicles* he cites "Bruttius" as authority for the statement that Domitilla was punished as a Christian. This "Bruttius" evidently, then, constitutes alone the "non-Christian writers" referred to in the *Church History*, and is plainly taken by Eusebius to have been a pagan.

Manuscripts and ancient versions of Eusebius give the name of his quoted authority variously (*Βρούττιος*, Brettius, Burtius), but what was doubtless intended is a transliteration of the Latin *gentilicium* Bruttius. This is a name by no means unknown in the late Republic and first three centuries of the Empire, though the chief source of our knowledge of it is inscriptions. Bruttii filled prominent offices in the

¹⁹ Eus. *H. E.* III. 18 (109).

²⁰ Philostratus (*Apoll.* 8.25) correctly says that Domitilla was the wife of Clemens, but calls her the sister of Domitian. As has been said above, she was the daughter of Domitian's sister; and she was also the "first cousin once removed" of her husband, Clemens, who was himself the son of T. Flavius Sabinus, brother of Vespasian, and got his *cognomen* apparently from his maternal grandfather, M. Arrecinus Tertullus Clemens. (In the account of Philostratus ἀδελφὴν may have been a slip of some copyist's pen for ἀδελφιδήν.) But the error of Eusebius, or of his Bruttius, joined with discrepancy in the name of the island to which Domitilla was banished (Dio says Pandateria, Eusebius—or Bruttius?—Pontia), and with some other variations in the Domitilla story (especially in the generally apocryphal *Acts of Sts. Nereus and Achilles*), has led various scholars to believe that there were actually two Domitillas of Domitian's kin banished by him. The notion appears to me certainly wrong, but does not intimately concern my present theme: however, those who are further interested may consult, against the duplication of Domitillas, Gsell's *Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Domitien*, and for it, Edmundson's *Church in Rome in the First Century*.

imperial administration. But it is a striking fact that no mention of or slightest allusion to a Bruttius who was an historian appears anywhere before Eusebius or for centuries after him. Only when we get down to John Malalas, that crabbed Byzantine who wrote in the sixth century or later, we find him quoting a Βούττιος, or Βόττιος, or Βώττιος, as an "historical chronographer," in the explanation of the Danae-myth and in comments on Alexander's campaigns. (Malalas' blundering copying of Eusebius on the Domitilla matter, and the further repetition by Syncellus and the *Chronicon Paschale* are of course without evidential significance.) This man is possibly the same as the Bruttius of Eusebius.

The various difficulties in the case have led some notable critics²¹ to believe that Bruttius is himself a myth, or at least that the ascription to him of testimony that Domitilla was a Christian is a pious manufacture out of whole cloth by some enthusiastic Christian not very long before the time of Eusebius. On the other hand, equally enthusiastic Christians of modern days, indignant at such airy and flippant treatment of revered antiquity, have asseverated that Eusebius could not have been misled (and presumably no Christian of those centuries could justly be suspected of embroidering up an insufficient narrative?), and they have gone so far as to present us from the known family list with a certain Brut-tius Praesens who might, for all we know, have sat in the senate in Domitian's time, and have been an eye-witness of the facts he recorded, and have written history. All this is of course quite without evidential value, even corroborative. It is merely an agreeable historical diversion.

One circumstance is of significance. Eusebius is especially fond of making excerpts from his authorities, and of quoting their precise words. He does not do so in the case of the testimony from Bruttius, and that too in a matter upon which Eusebius lays great weight in his argument, and ascribes much importance to his source. If Eusebius could

²¹ Cf. H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, II, pp. ccviii f.

have quoted the actual words, it seems altogether likely that he would have done so. The conclusion is unavoidable that he had never seen the actual text of Bruttius, but relied joyfully on some welcome report of it derived from some now unknown and probably Christian source. It is my opinion that, assumed the real existence of the chronographer, just as certain Christians of later date have found in the words even of Suetonius and of Dio (with a judicious use of interpretative imagination) "evidence" that both Clemens and Domitilla were Christians, so some eager Christian of the third century (or perhaps the second) interpreted a statement in Bruttius like that in Dio as really meaning that Domitilla was a Christian, and upon this sophisticated report Eusebius rested his affirmation.²²

In Eusebius, then, occurs the first and only extant intimation of a connection between the already alleged persecution of Christians by Domitian and his slaughter of the aristocrats. And it is noticeable that even Eusebius, in claiming Domitilla as a Christian *teste Bruttio*, does not extend that claim to Clemens the consul. That was reserved for later and more imaginative men. Evidently the Christian who (as I think most probable) foisted consciously or unconsciously upon Bruttius the statement that Domitilla was a Christian, had some prompting to his interpretation in record or tradition outside of such historical accounts as we have already examined, and some reason for not including Clemens in the same category, as we might naturally have expected him to do, the pagan account making in all probability no formal distinction at all in the cases against the two persons so closely related, and there being no conceivable motive for a pagan writer to set forth the case of Domitilla prominently above that of the equally noble and more famous Clemens.

How, then, did Domitilla come to be reputed as a Christian, and to be plainly discriminated from Clemens in this regard?

²² Did Iulius Africanus possibly come in here?

Here archaeology comes to the assistance of the extremely scanty literary tradition, and helps us to answer both parts of the question, without our being driven to take refuge in the generally unsafe postulation of an unsupported purely oral tradition.

The ancient *Itineraries* of the city of Rome mention a Cemetery of Domitilla (or of Domitilla and Nereus and Achilles) on the Via Ardeatina. It was more or less explored by Bosio in the last part of the sixteenth century, and a portion of it was freely accessible, and therefore freely plundered, throughout the most of the eighteenth century. The scientific examination of it dates from the middle of the nineteenth century.²³

It is established by inscriptions and other evidence that here on property belonging to Flauia Domitilla, granddaughter of Vespasian, was built the family burial-place of at least some of her connections among the Flavians, and in immediate conjunction therewith, doubtless by her express gift, was constructed a Christian cemetery, the earlier parts of which date back to the beginning of the second century. This cemetery appears to have continued in us, with successive extensions, till at least into the fourth century, and, as containing the tombs of martyrs, to have been visited for purposes of devotion much longer. It seems quite unlikely, if not impossible, that it should have been permitted in immediate connection with Domitilla's own family burial-place, and in her own probable lifetime, if she had not herself been a Christian. That inference from the archaeological evidence is stronger witness than any from the solitary affirmation in Eusebius on the alleged authority of a reported but unknown Bruttius.

It of course does not necessarily follow that Domitilla was already a Christian at the time of her exile by Domitian. She may have become so later, for her probable age would

²³ Cf., *inter alia*, H. Marucchi, *Éléments d'archéologie chrétienne*, II, *Itinéraire des catacombes* (ed. 2, Paris, 1903), and works therein referred to.

have made possible some decades of life in Rome after her speedy recall in 96 by Nerva with the rest of the political exiles of Domitian's reign. But if this prominent Roman matron were known to have suffered on charges that directly or indirectly involved religion, and her memory were preserved in the Roman Church by the constant use of the cemetery that went by her name (and perhaps by other benefactions), it would not be strange that the halo of martyrdom (in the broad sense of the word common in antiquity) for the profession of Christ should gather about her name. About it also gathered a mass of legendary matter, beginning apparently as early as the latter half of the second century. Some of this appears to have been due to a muddled tradition of facts (hence the story of the Domitilla, virgin niece of the consul Clemens), the rest to the operation of pious imagination. If her husband Clemens was also a Christian, memory of that fact would at any rate naturally fade away, because it had no tangible and lasting object, like Domitilla's grant of a cemetery, with which to connect and strengthen itself.

The discovery also of a Christian cemetery of later date centered about the family burial-place of the Acilii Glabrones has led to the conjecture or belief by some scholars that the Glabrio put to death by Domitian was also a Christian. This may be true, but it is not a reasonable inference from the extant archaeological evidence, which only goes to show that later members of his family had embraced the Christian faith.

With regard to the question whether Flavius Clemens actually was a Christian, there is also neither literary nor archaeological evidence accessible. Evidently Bruttius, whenever he wrote—if there ever was such a writer—had no knowledge that either Clemens or Glabrio was a Christian; for if he had supposed it to be the case, he would (we may conjecture) have had as much motive to record it of them (or at any rate of Clemens) as of Domitilla; and Eusebius, or his immediate source for the report of Bruttius, would

have been eager to add these two names of illustrious Romans to that solitary one of Domitilla. The late declaration by Syncellus that Clemens was a Christian is of no value whatever, since Syncellus had nothing to rest upon in that matter but Eusebius and his own imagination, in addition perhaps to a knowledge of Hermas, and more likely of the Clement-legend built up around the name of the reputed author of the letter of the Roman Church to the Corinthian.

The sweeping declaration by Orosius, early in the fifth century, that Domitian

"adventured to tear up from the roots the now established Church of Christ throughout all the world by issuing against her most cruel edicts of persecution,"²⁴ is no more worthy of serious attention than the many other of his unfounded and wildly rhetorical exaggerations.

Thus, then, stands the whole of the Christian testimony, literary and archaeological, strong or weak, that is not purely legendary. At the best it is manifestly very slight. There is a statement from the second half of the second century, made without details by Melito, and repeated by Hegesippus and Tertullian, that Domitian was for a brief time a persecutor, or disposed to become so. Then after the lapse of another century, there is the declaration in Eusebius, made professedly on pagan authority, that Domitilla "with very many others" suffered as a Christian under Domitian. Archaeology also indicates that Domitilla then or later was a Christian, not that she suffered as such. The statement about "very many others" is strikingly like that in Dio, and adds to the probability that the Christian reporter of Bruttius had merely found in him a remark that "very many others" were prosecuted like Domitilla on charges of "atheism." On the strength of Domitilla's reputation they are accordingly all reckoned as Christians by their unknown brother in the faith. At all events, this single, untraceable, and justly suspected phrase "with very many others" is the only evidence, pagan or Christian, of any considerable persecution of Christians by Domitian.

²⁴Oros, *adu.* Pag. VII. 10. 1.

Naturally every possible attempt has been made to twist into support of it the statements in Dio and Suetonius. I can find reason only for amusement in the frantic notion of those writers who are so loyally confident of the tremendous social importance of Christianity even in the pagan world of the first century, that they charge Dio with maliciously ignoring it, and in his account of the executions under Domitian with falsely and wilfully transferring to the Jewish faith that credit which he must have known belonged to Christianity. It may be at once conceded that a charge brought by Domitian against Christians as such would probably have been based on the offence of "atheism," that is, the lack of conformity especially in emperor-worship. But Jews and Judaizers would also be exposed to this charge, and it is altogether probable that many other citizens of the capital who were of the political opposition, but were neither Judaizers nor Christians, would lay themselves open to the same complaint by similar abstentions. The testimony of Dio cannot reasonably be impugned in its essence.

It has further been claimed that the characterization of Clemens by Suetonius as a man *contemptissimae inertiae* fits the popular description of a Christian, and therefore that must have been the religion of Clemens—an assertion made concerning him by no responsible ancient author, pagan or Christian. But the Suetonian description would fit as well a Jew or a Judaizer; and in view of Domitian's deadly jealousy of men of high rank, doubtless many pagans also would try to find safety, so far as permitted, in modest lives of self-effacement. Even so, Clemens, like Glabrio, had been consul, and as such must even have "bowed in the house of Rimmon," a thing we must believe no Christian would do. It is idle to see in the remark of Suetonius any indication that Clemens was a Christian, and that means there is no evidence of it whatever. It is of course possible, but I have known hundreds of cases where a woman was a church-member and her husband was not.

Another point deserves great attention. It is as nearly certain as very many historical facts of distant time can be, that since Nero's day intelligent Romans had been able to distinguish Christians as a sect, Jewish indeed in origin, but separated from Judaism. Suetonius was not well disposed toward Christians, though he betrays no especial animosity against Jews. He records among Nero's virtuous and praiseworthy deeds that he put to death members of the new and criminal sect of Christians.²⁵ If he had known that Domitian did the same, it is altogether probable that he would have recorded the fact, and have reckoned it to him also for righteousness. And Suetonius had every opportunity to be acquainted on the spot with every detail of the legal processes of the Terror. The necessary conclusion is that Domitian did not aim any attack against Christianity, and though Domitilla and possibly some of the other defendants may have been actually Christians, the fact did not appear in the trials. With this all the extant pagan testimony agrees, and it is unassailable.

What, then, was the basis of the second-century statement that Domitian started in to be a persecutor, which blossomed into the Eusebian affirmation that he definitely was so? The somewhat confused and inaccurate memory in the Roman Church of their illustrious fellow-member and great benefactress Domitilla, preserved alive by the continued use of her name attached to the property she had consecrated to the service of religion. It is possible also that the exile of St. John to Patmos, which must in all probability have been one of the isolated cases already conceded (like the later one of St. Ignatius), and was in the second century ascribed to the reign of Domitian,²⁶ may, on account of the revered position and character of the last survivor of The Twelve, have contributed to the creation or preservation of the vague notion that Domitian had for a short time been a persecutor.

²⁵ Suet. *Ner.* 16.

²⁶ Cf., *inter alia*, Iren. *adu. Haer.* V.30.3.

A CRITIQUE OF "MATTHEW'S SAYINGS OF JESUS" BY CASTOR

By FREDERICK C. GRANT, Evanston, Illinois

Matthew's Sayings of Jesus: the Non-Markan Common Source of Matthew and Luke. By George DeWitt Castor, Late Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in the Pacific School of Religion. [With a Postscript by Shirley Jackson Case, and Introduction by Benjamin W. Bacon.] The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1918, ix, 250 pages. \$1.25.

This is one of the most important works in Synoptic criticism ever published in America, and one of the most important treatments of "Q" which has appeared anywhere. Just as Harnack was led to publish his epoch-making *Sayings of Jesus* (1907; Eng. tr., 1908) by the appearance of Wellhausen's *Introduction to the First Three Gospels* (1905), so Castor's work is largely a criticism, in turn, of Harnack. The main argument of the book was read in an address before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in December, 1906—the date of Harnack's preface; nevertheless, the later elaboration of his thesis shows his reaction from the position of Harnack.

His criticism of Harnack is very severe (pp. 136-140). "Wendt's reconstruction of Q has been called [by Wernle], 'a heap of interesting ruins without beginning, without ending.' Almost as much might be said of the source which Harnack has found. The semblance of order which he gives is reached only by omitting a large portion of the material." It will be remembered that Harnack made Matthew rather than Luke the basis of his reconstruction. Castor's criticism of this procedure covers not only the question of the order of Q, but also its text (p. 133, *et passim*; yet cf. p. 215). In his own reconstruction of the order of Q, he has given Luke's order the priority; and for the text, has submitted both Matthew and Luke to a searching

criticism, resulting usually, in contrast to Harnack, in the preference of the Lukan text (*e.g.*, the Beatitudes, p. 219f). In fact, this is the chief distinction of Castor's work: he has made Luke rather than Matthew the basis for his reconstruction of Q. He points out that Luke did not rearrange his other source, Mark, as Matthew has done; and that hence he is not to be suspected of having done this with Q, which he treated with even greater respect (p. 137f).

The substance of the document Q is of course practically the same in Harnack's and in Castor's reconstruction. The following table of correlation will make this clear.

Castor § 1 = Harnack § 1

2 = 2

3 = 3-12 (Harnack omits Lk 6:45. Castor omits Mt 7:21 [Harn. § 12]).

4 = 13

5 = 14-15

6 = 17 (Harn. om. Lk 9: 61f, about which Castor is not quite positive).

7 = 16, 18, 20-22.

8 = 23, 24, 19.

9 = [Lk 10:17-20].

10 = 25

11 = 26

12 = 27 [+ Lk 11:5-8], 28. (H. om. Lk 11:1, and prefers the 'noteworthy rejected reading' in 11: 2, which he accordingly omits from Q).

13 } = 29 (H. om. Lk 11: 15, 18, 21f).

14 } = 29

15 = 30-32

16 = 33 (H. om. Lk 11: 40, 43, 45. C. is not sure about 11: 45; it 'may have stood in Q').

17 = 34a, 34b (H. om. Lk 12: 1b, 11f).

18 = 36. 35. (H. om. Lk 12: 32).

19 = 37 (H. om. Lk 12: 35-38).

20 = 38

21/22 = 39 (H. om. Lk 12: 54-57)

23 = [Lk 13: 1-9].

24 = 40

25 = 41-42 (H. om. Lk 13: 23, 25-27. C. is not sure about v. 23; 'this introductory question may not have stood in Q').

26 = 43

Harnack's § 44 is omitted by Castor (Mt 23: 12/Lk 14:11).

27 = 45-47 (H. om. Lk 14: 25, 28-32. C. says of v. 25 that 'Lk has probably expanded here to suit his context').

28 = 48-55 (H. om. Lk 15: 3, 8f [which C. himself questions]; and 17: 2. C. calls this 'a miscellaneous group' [p. 176] forming an appendix to Q; cf p. 151).

29 = 56 (H. om. Lk 17: 20-22, 25, 28-30).

Harnack's § 57 is omitted by Castor (Mt 10:39/Lk 17:33).

30 = 58 (H. om. Lk 19: 12-24, after considering it at length; cf *Sayings*, p. 122-126).

Harnack's § 59 is omitted by Castor (Mt 19: 28/Lk 22: 28, 30).

Castor suggests that Lk 17: 7-10; Mt 5: 14; 7: 6; 13: 44-46; and 18: 10 belong to Q.

It is apparent that Castor, making Luke rather than Matthew his basis, has included rather more of Luke than Harnack has done (Harnack uses the equivalent of 195 vv. of Luke; Castor, 260 vv.). It will also be noted at once that Harnack's numerical order of sections is almost that of Castor. But this is simply because in his restoration of the *text* Harnack has followed the order of Luke (*S.J.*, pp. 127-146); whereas, in his restoration of the *order*, he has undertaken to combine what he accepts as the data on this subject afforded by both Matthew and Luke (pp. 172-182; 253-271).

It will readily be admitted that the *disorder* which Harnack has attributed to Q is almost chaotic, despite his description of it as "in essential points natural and intelligible," and the subject-headings which he has given (p. 178f). And it is here that Castor has taken the step forward which makes his book so significant. In ch. IV ("Unity and Completeness of the Common Material in Matthew and Luke"), which is the strongest in the book, he has quite thoroughly demonstrated the unity and connected sequence of the sections as restored by him. It seems strange, in the light of Castor's work, to look back upon Harnack's reconstruction of Q, and to realize that in his first examination of the text, in the very order and numbering which he gave to the sections, Harnack had within his grasp the key with which Castor has unlocked the mystery. Harnack's preference for Matthew in the matter of the text led him to give Matthew too great weight in the matter of order; hence his rearrangement of the sections resulted in disorder and confusion. "We need only accept the order of Luke as a reliable witness for the order of his source, and to omit only what Matthew has omitted. Then, and not until then, does the general scheme which we have outlined appear. This shows also that it is not Luke's creation. Luke has tried to convert this topical into a chronological sequence. Some of his insertions can be explained in no other way, and the introductory settings that he has supplied point to the same conclusion" (Castor, p. 152f).

Although Harnack has the support of such scholars as B. Weiss, Hawkins, Allen, and Wernle, in his effort to combine the indications of Q's order derived impartially from Matthew and Luke, Castor by no means stands alone in his preference for Luke. Stanton (*The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part II, Camb., 1909) favors the Lukan order (p. 78; Stanton's chapter was written before the appearance of Harnack's *Sayings*, in the summer of 1906). His arrangement and topical analysis follow the order of Luke (p. 102ff)

and represent practically the conclusions of Castor. The dates of authorship preclude any possibility of dependence; and the results arrived at by the two scholars, each independently of the other, offer a striking mutual confirmation. Castor has also the support of Burkitt (*The Gospel History and Its Transmission*, 1906), J. A. Robinson (*The Study of the Gospels*, 1902), Holtzmann (*Introduction*³, and *Commentary*², 1892), von Soden (*Early Christian Literature*, 1905), and, more recent than all, Streeter (*Essay IV in Oxford Synoptic Studies*, 1911).

Castor's conclusion (p. 159) is that "Q was not written for missionary purposes. Knowledge of the general outline of Jesus' life was taken for granted. [He had already noted, p. 141, that 'while Q in no sense seeks to preserve a chronological order, we shall see that in broad outlines there is a recognition of the sequence the teachings had in Jesus' life.'] It was written for the benefit of the early Christian community, furnishing them a collection of the teachings of Jesus with their special problems and difficulties in mind." It was written originally in Aramaic, at a date sometime before, but probably not long before, the Gospel of Mark (p. 208). "The accommodation in Q of Jesus' teaching to the needs of the early Church is primarily a matter of arrangement and selection. No 'tendencies' can be observed. The author is very conservative in his treatment of this body of tradition." The 'problems of the early Church' which the author of Q had in mind were the admission of Gentiles, relations with followers of John the Baptist, opposition from the Pharisees, persecution, and the eschatological question—the date of the Parousia. [These interests are apparent in the document as reconstructed; they have nothing to do with the process of its reconstruction.] Castor agrees with Harnack that there is 'a strong balance of probability that Q is a work of St. Matthew' (ch. VIII). Its 'theology' is primitive. The term, 'Son of Man,' "is not explained in Q any more than it is in Mark, but, as is not so certain in Mark, in Q it always means the Messiah" (p. 142).

Castor offers us several examples of good exegesis, as of Lk 12: 57ff, "Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" etc.

"Taking, then, themselves as an example, they should use as much concern in avoiding God's judgment as they would in escaping the judgment of men. The obscurity of the passage is largely due to the form of the parable. It is given as a command, and the deeper meaning is only implied by the pregnant ἀμὴν λέγω σοι. This is not necessarily against the originality of the form here. All of Jesus' parables cannot be conformed to the quiet, calm tone of the "wise" man. As it stands, it is not necessary to give an allegorical interpretation to every feature. It can still be a true parable though in this dramatic form." (P. 94f; see also pp. 112 and 148.)

However, it is difficult to see the connection—not made clear by our author (p. 150)—of the saying "Salt is good," etc., (Mk 9: 50; Mt 5: 13; Lk 14: 34f), following the admonition to exercise prudence contained in the brief parables of the tower-builder and the warring king (pp. 175 and 244). It is difficult to see why a simpler solution is not offered by Harnack (S.J., p. 54f), who prefers the Matthean form of the saying [we might question this], and supposes Luke's version to be due to the influence of Mark. In Luke, therefore, the verse is an editorial addition to his own peculiar matter in 14: 28–32. The saying was then given by both Mark and Q—Harnack § 47—as Castor also thinks (p. 201). This seems reasonable, unless, with Loisy (*Ev. Syn.*, I, 554), we are to attribute all three forms of the saying directly to oral tradition.

Another and similar difficulty is to be found in § 23, one of the cases where Castor attributes peculiar Lukan material to Q (Lk 13: 1–9). Here we have the Parable of the Unfruitful Fig Tree, somewhat resembling the narrative of the Cursing of the Fig Tree in Mark 11: 12ff. Matthew's "omission" of the parable, while giving the narrative, and Luke's omission of the narrative while giving the parable is a phenomenon difficult to explain but still very suggestive. Castor points out the Semitic traces in Luke's parable, and suggests that Matthew's "omission" (granting that it stood

in Q) is due to the similarity existing between Luke's parable and Mark's narrative (p. 170f). That is, the parable belonged to Q, the narrative to Mark. And the Matthean and Lukan use or disuse of either is editorial. Beyond this, "whatever relation there may be between the parable of Luke and the miracle of Mark belongs to the period of oral tradition" (p. 200).

Castor's whole treatment of the relation of the common source to Mark (ch. VII) is weakened by the almost constant appeal to oral tradition. He nowhere else falls back upon it so readily. Perhaps he was anxious to escape the complicated theory of Mark's dependence upon Q—oral tradition affording a simpler and more natural explanation of the divergences noticeable throughout their likenesses. There are certainly difficulties enough confronting this theory, but Castor does not seem to give sufficient consideration to the arguments in its favor. He says in reference to the Beelzebub-calumny (§ 13), given in Mk 3: 22-27, Mt 12: 22-30, Lk 11: 14-23, "Here any dependence of the one account on the other [Mark on Q, or Q on Mark] is impossible; the differences are too fundamental" (p. 197). And yet the differences in the two accounts, the Markan and the Matthean-Lukan, are hardly greater than between Matthew's and Luke's versions of the Sermon on the Mount, or of the Mission of the Twelve!

Castor touches only briefly (pp. 205-207) on the problem involved in the Matthean-Lukan contacts and minor agreements scattered through passages taken from Mark, of which B. Weiss has made so great (perhaps too great) use in his reconstruction of the earliest evangelic sources. He says, "Later change in Mark, combined with the other lines of argument [epitomized by Allen, *Mt.*, pp. xxxviii-xl] seems to us in every way the most satisfactory explanation of the phenomena that confront us in the use which Matthew and Luke make of Mark. It is more in accord with the incidental character of the common variations which are so well

distributed over the whole Gospel" (p. 206f). This is strange, if the later tendency—"later change"—was to harmonize the gospels, rather than the reverse. Yet the suggestion fits in admirably with Sanday's suggestion (*Oxf. Syn. Stud.*, 1911, p. 22f; cf Allen, *l.c.*; Stanton, p. 142f) that two recensions of Mark existed, the one used by Matthew and Luke differing slightly from that which has come down to us. The whole problem of Q's relation to Mark, treated at length by Harnack as well (*Sayings*, ch. VI, chiefly with reference to Wellhausen's theory of Q's dependence upon Mark), needs further examination.

Castor's treatise is a mature contribution. It is critical throughout, thorough, and masterly. We believe that he has sufficiently proved his main thesis, *viz.*, that in the reconstruction of the lost source used by Matthew and Luke, in addition to their use of Mark, greater confidence is to be placed in its Lukan version than has heretofore been common; and that, in particular, it is Luke rather than Matthew which has preserved the original order of this source.

It is a choice tribute to Professor Castor's work, and one completely merited, that the book was published almost six years after his death. It represents the worthy fruitage of one scholar's lifetime, all too brief. One cannot but keenly regret the loss to American scholarship represented by his death. His work is on the level of the best which this country has produced.

THE MONASTERY OF ST. HONORATIUS ON THE ISLAND OF LÉRINS¹

By REV. EDWIN S. LANE, Chaplain U. S. Army

The founders of Monasticism knew well how to select beautiful and attractive as well as secluded sites for their retreat from the world. Off the southern shores of French Provence, opposite the beautiful town of Cannes, two islands float like oases of green on the surface of the emerald blue waters of the Mediterranean. These are the Isles of Lérins, the outermost to be made famous through its selection by a young Gaul of the name of Honoratius, seeking to find a place of quiet for the ascetic practice of his faith in Christ.

The date and place of Honoratius' birth are uncertain, but early his thoughts were turned to the life of solitude made known to him perhaps by the visit of S. Athanasius to Gaul in 336 A.D. Montalembert writes of the latter's exile "that he inflamed all the clergy of Gaul by his ardor for the faith of Nicaea and for the admirable life of the recluses of the Thebaid."

Whatever the genesis of the idea, Honoratius determined to visit the East to learn from the monks of the desert the ascetic life. A friend accompanied him, but on this one's death in Greece Honoratius decided to give up his journey. He returned to Frejus in Provence and placed himself under the saintly Bishop Leonce. The latter assigned the new arrival to a cavern on Cap Roux, the extreme end of a rocky promontory of the Maritime Alps, jutting boldly into the sea between Frejus and Cannes.

Though secluded in this wild and rocky oratory with only

¹The chief reference for this account is found in *L'Ile et L'Abbaye de Lérins*, par Un Moine de Lérins. Lérins, Imprimerie de l'abbaye, deuxième édition, 1909.

one companion, Honoratius was not to be allowed to rest in peace. The fame of the two reached wide and in spite of the difficulty of access brought many to ask for prayers and counsel. Anxious to escape from these interruptions his eyes often wandered across the bay to the uninhabited isles, and finally, with the consent of the bishop, he took up his dwelling on the outermost, which was later to bear his name.

The island had the reputation of being infected with such venomous serpents that no one dared to land, but from the moment St. Honoratius set foot, it was completely purged. Here is the chronicler's account of the miracle. "The saint, on his arrival at the island, seeing the serpents rushing towards him, prostrated himself and prayed the Lord to exterminate them. Immediately they all expired. But their decaying bodies so infected the air that the saint climbs a palm tree, and raising his hands to heaven prays again with great fervor. Then the sea becomes elevated, the waves inundate the entire surface of the island, and on retiring take with them the bodies of the reptiles." This version varies from a painting on the walls of the present Chapter house, which depicts the Saint as advancing with the cross upraised in his right hand and the snakes retreating before him into the sea. Since S. Patrick, the apostle to Ireland, was one of the early inhabitants of the monastery, an interesting ground for speculation is opened as to the reputed clearance of Ireland of its serpents.

The date of the arrival of St. Honoratius on the island is uncertain. The *Chronicle of Lerins* gives it as the year 375. Some modern historians set the date around 400 A.D.

The Rule of St. Honoratius was a mixture of the solitary and the monastic. The monastery proper was not very large and included only those who desired the communal rather than the life of solitude. Those who desired the latter received authority to retire to one of the numerous cells scattered over the island and there dwell as a hermit. For these seven chapels were constructed in different sections, and

on Sundays all were expected to assemble in the monastery church, to take part in the Liturgy.

Another incident in the life of Honoratius is worth repeating. After his occupation of the outermost of the two islands, his sister Marguerite took up her residence on the other and founded a convent of nuns. Marguerite complains that her brother did not visit her frequently enough, but Honoratius, finding that the few visits he did pay interfered with his set course of life, announced that he would only come once a year. He fixed the time as the season when the cherry trees were in blossom. The sister weeps at this but she hopes that God will be less inflexible, and we read "she obtains from Him who blesses His beloved Saints that a cherry tree planted on the shore of St. Honoratius' island, blossom every month. St. Honoratius sees in this prodigy the manifest will of the Lord, and every month, crossing the sea made solid under his feet, he comes to talk of God to the happy Marguerite."

On the first half of the fifth century it would appear that much of the spiritual and intellectual life of Europe was for the moment concentrated within the boundaries of the island. St. Eucher entered Lerins about 412. He was of noble family and bore the Roman title of *Clarissime*. Though married and the father of four children, with the consent of his wife he decided to enter the monastic life and brought with him to Lerins his two sons Salonius and Veranus, both of whom became bishops. Eucher himself was made bishop of Lyons and proved a worthy occupant of the see of St. Irenaeus.

Lerins is perhaps best known through another of its sons, Vincent. He first followed a military career and occupied an exalted position in the world. The purity of his style and the vigor of his reasoning show that he had received an excellent education, rare in those days. Of himself he writes that having been tossed about in the whirlpool of the secular life he was led by the inspiration of Christ to the calm port of the

religious life and there applied himself to escape not only the shipwrecks of the present but also the flames of the future life. Somewhere about 434 St. Vincent composed at Lerins his "commonitorium," which instantly became famous and has not lost its interest and value through the lapse of the ages. It is in this work that he gives his test for orthodoxy—"Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est." Few uninspired sayings have been so acceptable.

Another contemporary was Salvien. He and St. Vincent, at a time when most of the great men of Lerins were called as bishops to the sees of France, remained, as a biographer naively remarks, "Simple priests." Salvien has been called the Jeremiah of the fifth century.

As has been said above St. Patrick also spent nine years at Lerins, receiving, there the training which led to his future greatness.

In 426 St. Honoratius left Lerins to become bishop of the Metropolitan and primatial church of Arles, but for over 250 years his monastery proceeded along the lines which he laid down. It furnished five other bishops to Arles, among whom may be mentioned St. Hilary and St. Virgilius. The latter was the consecrator of St. Augustine the apostle of England.

It was at Lerins that the companions of St. Augustine spent the time, in 596, while he, deterred from undertaking his mission to England by the rumors he had heard of the difficulties, went to Rome for further instructions from Gregory the Great. We are told that when St. Augustine returned with the views that they were to try again, he found his companions so strengthened in their faith by their stay at Lerins that they were willing and glad to undertake with him the perilous task.

In the seventh century Lerins was most prosperous. The rule of S. Benedict was then in the vigor of its strength, while there are evidences that time and prosperity had caused considerable relaxation of the rule of St. Honoratius, at any

rate about the middle of the century a deputation of the monks of Lerins waited on Aygulphe, Abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Fleury-sur-Loire, and asked him to become their head and introduce the new rule. At first he declined, but consented after many appeals and was received with much enthusiasm.

Two monks however resisted the strictness and discipline of the new order of things and succeeded in arousing a small mutiny. An attempt was made to murder the Abbot while at prayer, but the power and calmness of his mien drove them back abashed. They bided their time and soon succeeded in persuading, by the hope of pillage, the count of Uzes to aid them. He invades the island and demands of Aygulphe that he be shown the treasures of the monastery. The abbot holds out his hands and points to his monks saying, "In these consist my treasures". The count, in a rage, binds the abbot and his monks, pillages all, and departs. Fearing the vengeance of the king the two traitors put the bound Abbot and the others into a boat with them and leave the island, intending to murder their prisoners on some desolate coast. A violent storm arises, which is only appeased by the miraculous power of the holy Abbot, and they are driven ashore on the island of Amaritince between Corsica and Sardinia. There the traitors martyr their captives. One however escapes and brings the sad news back to Lerins. At the return of spring a deputation leaves to search for the bodies to bring them back as relics. The story runs: "They found them intact and ruddy (sic) as if the death of the holy victims had happened that very day. One monk, having been for a long time paralysed in one arm, recovered its use on touching them. During the singing of psalms and hymns the bodies were placed in the boats, and they exhaled such a sweet odor that one might have believed them to be charged with flowers or perfume." This martyrdom of St. Aygulphe and his thirty companions took place about the year 660.

In spite of this unfortunate beginning the introduction of the Benedictine rule proved very successful, and by 690 the Abbot St. Amond ruled over 3700 monks at Lerins and its dependencies on the mainland.

Exposed as was the island to the open sea, it suffered much from the attacks of pirates and especially from frequent raids by the Saracens. At one time five hundred monks were murdered in cold blood, practically the whole of the monastery, only four remaining to describe the scenes of horror. Finally, in the last quarter of the tenth century, the illustrious St. Mayeul, Abbot of Cluny, aroused the Christian population to such an extent that the Saracen invaders were driven out from the territory of southern France. The monks of Lerins then restored their buildings, but dwelt for a short time only in peace, for the Saracens now set forth from Spain and ravaged as in days of old. St. Mayeul seized this opportunity to request the pope to appoint him Abbot of Lerins, and in spite of opposition this was done, and between 975 and 983 Lerins remained a dependency of Cluny.

Pillaged again in 1047 and again restored, Adelbert II, during the period of his Abbacy, 1066-11021, began the construction of a monastic fortress in which the community could take refuge and defend themselves. Nearly a century elapsed before the building was finally completed, but thereafter it served its purpose well, and to this day, though now partly in ruins, it remains one of the landmarks of the southern coast. During this Great War it has played a part as a watch tower against submarines.

During the great schism the monastery had a hard time. The abbacy becoming vacant, Boniface IX, who held the papal chair at Rome, appointed a certain Rostang and sent a papal legate expressly to see that the appointment was carried out. On the other hand Clement VII, who ruled from Avignon, appointed Nicholas as abbot, and for twenty years the two lived side by side, the struggle going on as to which was the authoritative abbot. Martin V, the "peace pope,"

succeeded in straightening things out by the selection of an abbot who won the support of all the monks. Under him Lerins resumed somewhat of its former greatness and became a favorite shrine for pilgrims. To all those who made the pilgrimage between the Feast of the Ascension and Pentecost Martin V gave full absolution.

In the fifteenth century the introduction of holding the abbacy "in commendam," *i.e.*, the appointment of one (usually some prominent person) who received the revenues but did not exercise the actual spiritual function of abbot, but delegated it to an underling, had a disastrous effect on Lerins. In 1464 Isnard, who belonged to an illustrious family of Grasse, was made the commendatory abbot and held the position for 16 years, without doing much for the monastery and from him its decline may be said to have begun. In fact by the early part of the next century the degeneration was so marked that it was combined with the Benedictine congregation of Monte Cassino. No valid result coming from this, in 1638 the congregation of Cluny again came to the rescue.

Cardinal Mazarin was named abbot commendatory in 1654, and some idea of the revenues of Lerins may be gathered from the fact that he attempted to compromise with the monks, who strongly resisted his appointment, that he should receive a pension of only 9000 pounds (a much larger sum today). Mazarin agreed but did not hold to his contract, and succeeded in appropriating the entire revenues until the day of his death.

By the middle of the eighteenth century things had come to such a pass that the Bishop of Grasse, not without self interest, composed a memoir asking for the secularization of Lerins. He reported that on a visit he only found six monks; only three were able to meet him, the three others being confined in their cells under guard. How this condition arose may be easily imagined when it is known that this was the bishop's first visit and that he had been the commendatory abbot for eleven years. Finally, in 1787, a later bishop of

Grasse secured a bull from Pius V. authorizing the union of Lerins with his diocese and its secularization. In 1788 the canonical suppression of the abbey was pronounced and confirmed by the council of state. Only four monks were left and they were retired with a pension of 1500 pounds each. So passed the congregation of St. Honoratius!

During the French Revolution the island was confiscated by the government and declared national property. It was sold at auction and fell into the hands of one Maire Blanche, a retired actress of the Comédie Française, who, under the name of Mlle. Sainval, occupied the fortified monastery of which we have previously spoken. At her death the island was sold and after several more changes fell into the possession of an English clergyman by the name of Sims.

In 1859 Mgr. Jordany, then Bishop of Frejus, one of whose ancestors had been an abbot of Lerins, bought the island with the purpose of reestablishing a religious community. Some Brothers of the order of St. Francis were first installed, then replaced by another congregation who conducted an orphanage. Difficulties developing, the Bishop later asked a Cistercian congregation, then resident in the diocese of Avignon, to establish itself on the island, and by 1871 the monastic life was again flourishing on the site of the labors of St. Honoratius—new cloisters and a chapel were built and the ancient refectory and Chapter house restored.

It fell to the good fortune of the writer to visit this new monastery. Approached from the landing place through a beautiful canopied arch of cypress trees, the monastery today gives the impression of having regained much of its ancient dignity and religious fervor. The war has sadly depleted its ranks, nineteen of the monks being with the army and two having laid down their lives "pour la France." Those left number twenty-five professed, and some lay brethren. These carry on the life of work, praise, and prayer, with a vigor which may once more win for Lerins the fame and respect which it possessed in the first centuries of its existence.

AN OLD TESTAMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR 1914 TO 1917, INCLUSIVE

(Continued from Vol. I, page 332)

By H. C. ACKERMAN, Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wis.

VII. c. 4. c. Minor

- AALDERS, G. C., 'Het huwelijk van Hosea', Geref. theol. Tijdschs. 1915, 21-33.
- BARNES, E., 'The prophet of the God of love', Exp. 1915, Feb.
- BARNES, W. E., *Haggai and Zechariah and Malachi*, Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1917, pp. ix+118; xv+27.
- BLACKWOOD, A. W., 'Social Message of Micah', Union Sem. Magazine, 1914, Oct.
- BUDDE, K., 'Zur Geschichte des Buches Amos' (Wellh. *Festschr.* 63-77).
- BURKITT, F. C., 'The Psalm of Habakkuk', JTS 16, 62-66.
- BUZY, D., 'Les Symboles d'Osée', RB1917, 376-423.
- CASPARI, W., 'Die Nachrichten über Heimat und Hausstand des Propheten Hosea und ihre Verfasser', NkZ 26, 143-168. 'Wer hat die Aussprüche des Propheten Amos gesammelt?' NkZ25, 701-715.
- CASSUTO, U., 'Questioncelle Bibliche: la patria del profeta Nahum'. Giorn. d. Soc. Asiatica Italiana, 26, 2.
- COOKE, G. A., ed., *The Book of Amos. With notes by E. A. Edghill*, London: Methuen, 1914, pp. 146.
- CRAFER, T. W., *Books of Ezra and Malachi*, Cambridge: Univ. Pr., 1917.
- CRUVEILHIER, P., 'De l'interprétation historique des événements de la vie familiale du prophète Osée (I-III)', RB 1916, 342-362.
- DAICHES, S., 'Amos 3 : 3-8', ET26, 237.
- DÖLLER, J., 'Jonas als Heidenmissionar', Zeitschr. f. Missionwissenschaft, 4, 173-176.
- HAUPT, P., 'Was Amos a Sheepman?' JBL35, 280-287.
- HUMBERT, P., *Un héraut de la justice, Amos*, Lausanne, 1917, pp. 36.
- ISOPESCU, S. O., 'Übersetzung und Auslegung des Buches Abdias', WZKM28, 149-181.
- JENSON, J. K. R., *Amos og Hosea*, Kopenhagen: Gyldendal, 1914, pp. 122.
- LANCHESTER, H. C. O., *Joel and Amos*, Cambridge: Univ. Pr., 1915, pp. 251.
- MACLAGEN, P. J., 'Amos 9 : 3', ET26, 237.
- MACLOSKIE, G., 'How to test the Story of Jonah', BS72, 334-338.
- MARTI, K., 'Die Zweifel an der prophetischen Sendung Sacharjas' (Wellh. *Festschr.*, 279-299.
- MONTGOMERY, J. A., 'Brief Communications. II. The Wailing of Haddad-Rimmon', JBL33, 78-80.
- NORTHCOTE, H., 'The Song of Habakkuk', ET25, 522-524.

- PEISER, F. E., *Hosea, Philologische Studien zum A. T.*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914, pp. ix+87.
- PRAETORIUS, F., 'Zum Text des Amos', ZAW34, 42-44.
- PRAETORIUS, F., 'Bemerkungen zu Amos', *ib.*, 35, 12-25.
- PROCKSCH, O., *Die Kleinen Prophet. Schriften nach dem Exil*, pp. 124.
- RICHTER, G., *Erläuterungen zu dunkeln Stellen in den Kleinen Propheten*. Gütersloh: Bertelsman, 1914, pp. iv+199.
- ROBINSON, J. H., 'The Structure of the Book of Obadiah', JTS17, 402-408.
- SANDROCK, G., 'Die Ehe Hoseas', Kirchl. Z. 1914, 545-556.
- SELLIN, 'Antisamaritanische Auslegungen im Texte des Amosbuches', OrLz17, 155f.
- SMITH, J. M. P., 'Note on Hos. 4 : 2', AJT1915, 275f.
- TAIT, A. J., *The Prophecy of Micah*, New York: Scribner's, 1917, pp. vii+127.
- WILLIAMS, A. L., *The Minor Prophets Unfolded*, London: SPCK, 1917, pp. 69.
- ZIEGLER, J., *Die Propheten Amos und Hosea*, Frankfurt: Kauffmann, 1914, pp. 53.

Barnes—Like all recent editions of The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges these three commentaries have good and scientific introductions. Javan does not denote the Syro-Greeks but rather some remote little people, so its occurrence is no help toward fixing the date. The second half of Zechariah is definitely the sequel of Zechariah 1-8. **Budde** seeks to show that 7 : 10-17 is a fragment and does not stand in its original place. **Burkitt**—A Pentecostal hymn written soon after the Josiah reformation. **Buzy**—A study of Hosea from the Roman Catholic standpoint. **Caspari** distinguishes the hands through which the book has passed to its present state: a compiler and a redactor. He holds to the facts of the marriage story. The wife abandoned herself in the interest of the cultus—generally *versus* Hölscher's views. In regard to the question of the compilation of Amos he suggests a compiler whose work lacks scientific revision. **Cruveilhier** studies the relative merits of the symbolic and historical interpretations and compromises in a theory of retrospective subjectivism. **Döller** borrows from the Jonah narrative certain thoughts which shall inspire universal missionary activity. **Haupt** answers no—an Israelite gardener living in Judah after banishment from the Northern Kingdom. **Isopescul**—A commentary, verse by verse, according to content and philology. **Lanchester**—Cambridge Bible. The Locusts are not to be identified with the Day of Yahweh, but are only a sign of its approach. He argues for the genuine-

ness of Amos 9 : 8-15. **Macloskie** points out that Jonah could have lived in the belly of the whale and escaped. **Marti** studies the genuineness of 2 : 13, 15; 4 : 9; 6 : 15 and thinks they are too late; but this seems questionable. **Montgomery**—The *El* of the Phœnicians offers his only son. **Northcote** submits a new poetical version of the song. No religious thought has ever been able to detach the huge fact of pain from its connection with the will of God. **Peiser's** painstaking little book consists of a philological study of the Book of Hosea, reconstructing the text and giving a new translation on that basis. **Prætorius**—Textual emendations. In ZAW³⁵ he makes notes upon various passages. **Richter's** volume is a welcome addition to the well-known work done by the author upon Job. **Robinson** sees in the structure of Obadiah a collection of fragments of longer poems, of different dates, referring to Edom, having circulated a long time in isolated form before being compiled. **Sellin**—Relevant to chap. 5 : 26; 8 : 14; 4 : 3b. **Tait**—One of *The Short Course Series* published to meet the needs of layman and Sabbath-School teacher. **Williams** discusses simply and well the Book of the Twelve in the light of the war. **Ziegler**—*Volkschr. über d. jüd. Religion*.

VII. d. 5. THE WRITINGS. a. *The Psalms*

- BAIN, J. A., 'Psalm 145', ET²⁶, 94 f.
 BARNES, W. E., 'The Text of Psalm 2 : 12', JTS¹⁸, 24-29.
 BARNES, W. E., 'Revision of the Prayer Book Psalter', JTS¹⁸, 61-67.
 BARNES, W. E., 'Selah—Some Facts and a Suggestion', JTS¹⁸, 263-273.
 BARNES, W. E., 'Textual Criticism of the Old Testament. An Instance (Ps. xcvi, 11)', JTS¹⁷, 152-156, 385-388.
 BARNES, W. E., 'A Study of Psalm xci', Exp. 10, 224-233.
 BELL, M., *Psalterium Davidicum breviter explanatum*, Turin: Marietti, 1914, pp. xii+410.
 BERRY, G. R., 'The Titles of the Psalms', JBL³³, 198-200.
 BINDLEY, T. H., 'The Titles of the Psalms', Interp.¹³, 42-49.
 BINYON, G. C., 'The Church's Use of the Psalms', Interp.¹³, 63-67.
 BONACCORSI, J., *Psalterium latinum cum graeco et hebraeo comparatum explanavit, annotat. grammaticis instruxit. Lib. I.*, Florenz: Libr. ed. fior., 1914, pp. 112; *ib.*, Lib. II., 1915, pp. 113-274.
 BUDDE, K., *Die schönsten Psalmen*, Leipzig: Amelangs, 1915, pp. 125. 'Zum Text der Psalmen', ZATW¹⁹¹⁵, 175-195.

- BURBRIDGE, A. T., 'The Autobiographic Element in the Psalms', *Interp.* 11, 95-106.
- BUTTENWIESER, M., 'Are there any Maccabaeian Psalms?', *JBL* 36, 225-248.
- CAPELLE, P., *Le Texte du psautier latin en Afrique*, Rome, 1914, pp. xi+267.
- COLLIJN, I., 'Annu ett exemplar af Psalterium Upsalense', *Nord. Tidskr. f. Bok- och Biblioteksväsen* I., 1914, 368.
- DIE PSALMEN, Leipzig: Inselverlag, 1915, pp. 211.
- DRIVER, S. R., *Studies in the Psalms*, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1915, pp. xi+301.
- EBERT, P., *Das Kreuz Christi in Weissagung und Erfüllung*, Schwerin: Bahn, 1914, pp. 88.
- EISELEN, F. C., *The Psalms and Other Sacred Writings*.
- EMMET, C. W., *Plea for a Revised Use of the Psalter*, London: Milford, 1917.
- EMMET, BURNEY & SANDAY, *Use of the Psalter*, New York: Oxford Univ. Pr.
- FÖRSTER, M., *Die französischen Psalmen-übersetzungen vom 12. bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrh.*, Berlin: Ebering, 1914, 24-279.
- GOOSSENS, E., *Die Frage nach makkabäischen Psalmen*, Münster: Aschendorff, 1914, pp. x+72.
- GODWIN, C. H. S., *The Anglican Proper Psalms*, Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1915, pp. x+88.
- GORDON, A. R., 'Pioneers in the Study of Old Testament Poetry', *ET* 25, 511-516.
- GÖTTSCHEBERGER, J., 'Psalm 110 (109), hebräisch und lateinisch, mit textkritischen Apparat', *BZ* 12, 113-115.
- GRAY, G. B., *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1915, pp. x+300.
- HALL, A. C. A., *The Psalter*, New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1916, pp. 43.
- HASTINGS, J., *The Great Texts of the Bible: Psalm cxix to Song of Songs*, London: Clark, 1915, pp. 488.
- ib.*, *Psalms*, 24-119, Edinburgh: Clark, 1914, pp. 462.
- HAUPT, P., 'The Inauguration of the Second Temple', *JBL* 33, 161-169.
- HERZOG, F. A., 'Der Fluchpsalm 108', *Schweiz. Kz.*, 1915, 216 f.
- HIRSCH, S. R., *Die Psalmen übersetzt und erläutert*, Frankfurt: Kauffmann, 1914, pp. xv+334; 330.
- DR. JAYNE, and others. (Committee of eight appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury), *Revision of the Prayer-Book Psalter*, London: SPCK, 1916, pp. 43.
- JEANNOTTE, H., 'Le Texte du psautier de Saint Hilaire de Poitiers', *RB* 1916, 61-89.
- JETZINGER, F., 'Ps. 125. In convertendo Dominus captivitatem Sion', *TPQ* 68, 209-211.
- Johannes Calvins Auslegung des Heiligen Schrift in deutscher Übersetzung*, 5. Bd.: *Die Psalmen*, 2. Hälfte, Neukirchen: Buchh. des Erziehungsvereins, 1914, pp. 686.
- JORDON, W. G., *Religion in Song*, London: J. Clark & Co., 1915 (?).
- KENT, C. F., *The Songs, Hymns and Prayers of the Old Testament*, New York: Scribner's, 1914, pp. xxi+305.
- KÖNIG, E., *Hebraische Rhythmik*, Halle: Waisenhauses, 1914, pp. viii+76.

- KING, E. G., 'Psalm cxxx', *Interp.* 11, 161-168.
- KITTEL, R., *Die Psalmen*, Leipzig: Deicherts, 1914, pp. lix+521.
- LANGE, H. O., 'Ett Psalterium trykt af Gotfred af Ghemen', *Nord. Tidskr. f. Bok-och Biblioteksväsen* I., 1914, 363-366.
- LYALL, C. J., 'The Relation of the Old Arabian Poetry to the Hebrew Literature of the Old Testament', *JAS* 1914, 253-266.
- MASS, M., 'Bericht über eines Vortrag von C. J. Lyall, Altarabische Poesie und die hebräische Literatur des A. T.', *ThLz* 36, 253 f.
- MADDOX, H. E., 'The Hundred and Twenty-first Psalm', *Interp.* 10, 430-434.
- MCFADYEN, J. E., 'The Psalter and the Present Distress', *ET* 28, 245-249, 305-307, 373-377.
- MCLEAN, N., 'Textual Criticism of the Old Testament', *JTS* 1916, 298-299.
- NAIRNE, A., 'Psalm lviii, 10 (9)', *JTS* 16, 252-254.
- PETERS, J. P., 'Hebrew Psalmody', *HTR* 9, 36-55.
- PETERS, J. P., 'Ritual in the Psalms', *JBL* 35, 143-154.
- PRATT, W. S., 'Studies in the Diction of the Psalter. III', *JBL* 33, 1-24; IV. 127-151.
- PROTHERO, R. E., *The Psalms in Human Life*, London: Murray, 1914, pp. 432.
- PRINX MAX, *Erklärung der Psalmen und Cantica in ihre liturgischen Verwandung*, Regensburg: Pustet, 1914, pp. 528.
- ROTHSTEIN, J. W., *Hebräische Poesie*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914, pp. viii+109.
- SANDAY and EMMET, *The Psalms Explained*, New York: Oxford Univ. Pr.
- SCHLÖGL, N. J., ed., *Die Heiligen Schriften des Allen Bundes. III. Die poetisch-didaktischen Bücher. I. Die Psalmen*, Leipzig: Orion-Verlag, 1915, pp. xix+146+*35.
- SCHROEDER, O., 'Zu Psalm 19', *ZAW* 34, 69 f.
- SCHROEDER, O., 'Versuch einer Erklärung von Ps. 68 : 14b, 15', *ZAW* 34, 70-72.
- SEIPLE, W. G., 'The Seventy-Second Psalm', *JBL* 33, 170-197.
- THACKERAY, H. St. J., *Three Lectures on the Psalms*, London: G. Bell & Sons, 1917, pp. 38.
- THACKERAY, H. St. J., 'The Song of Hannah and Other Lessons and Psalms for the Jewish New Year's Day', *JTS* 16, 177-204.
- THACKERAY, H. St. J. and BARNES, W. E., 'Psalm lxxvi and other Psalms for the Feast of Tabernacles', *JTS* 15, 425-432.
- THALHOFER, V., *Erklärung der Psalmen und der im römischen Brevier vorkommenden biblischen Cantica mit besonderer Rücksicht auf deren liturgischen Gebrauch*, Regensburg: Manz, 1914, pp. xii+896.
- VAN KOEVERDEN, W., 'Le psaume xxxix', *RB* 1915, 563-568.
- VAN SANTE, 'Le psaume 110 (Vulg. 109) "Dixit Dominus"', *BZ* 12, 22-28, 135-141, 238-250.
- WIESMANN, H., 'Ps. 24+15 (LXX 23+14)', *ZkTh* 39, 404-407.
- WIESMANN, H., 'Ps. 91 (LXX Vulg. 90)', *ib.*, 39, 407-410.
- WIKENHAUSER, A., 'Zu Psalm 44 (45), 2', *Korrespondenzblatt, Amtl. Zeitschr.* 59, 75-79.
- ZORELL, F., 'Psalm 136 und sein Refrain', *BZ* 13, 23 f.
- ZORELL, F., *Einführung in die Metrik und die Kunstformen der hebräischen psalmendichtung*. Mit 40 Text-proben, Münster: Aschendorff, 1914, iv+52.

Barnes—In regard to Psalms 2 : 12 "Whether the words be Aramaic or Hebrew, they stand confirmed by dictionary and by grammar." The article on the Prayer Book Psalter is the report of a committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. SPCK, 1916. It is suggested that *Selah*, a *nota bene*, simply calls attention to the context in which it is embedded. In the JTS17 he illustrates the uncertainty which besets the work of the textual critic by reference to the treatment of Psalms 97 : 11 (Cf. McLean, JTS17, 298 f who resents Barnes' depreciation of the LXX. See also *ib.* 17, 385-388.) In Exp10—a scholarly exposition of the 'Temple Psalm' (addressed to an inhabitant of Zion). **Belli**—Second edition. **Berry** in connection with Briggs' commentary employs the psalm redactions to determine the succession of the small groups of psalms. **Bindley** classifies the headings and discusses them in order. **Binyon's** thesis is this: The sense we give to the psalms should be one in essence with their original and natural meaning. **Budde's** book is a popular exposition of some of the finest specimens of the Psalter. His article is a textual and critical study. **Burbridge** illustrates two autobiographical elements (Psalms 14 and 16). **Buttenwieser** emphasizes in this connection the importance of the dying out of Hebrew as a spoken language in post-exilic times. This edition of *Die Psalmen* follows Luther's last revision of the German Bible. **Dr. Burney** has brought together varied material bearing on the Psalter left by the late Canon Driver with this successful result. The volume is a welcome example of the relation of scientific study to popular need. **Ebert** gives an exposition of Psalm 22 and Isaiah 53. **Eiselen**—A sane treatment of their origin, contents and significance. **Förster's** dissertation is a contribution to the history of French translation. **Goossens** dissertation is based upon an exhaustive history of this question. **Godwin**—A good critical and exegetical discussion of obscure passages in the proper psalms used in the English Church—the work of a sound scholar. **Gordon** presents in summary fashion Ewald's views. **Gray** considers the principles of Hebrew poetry in their

mutual relation with special reference to the criticism and interpretation of the Old Testament, but no new theory of metre is set forth. The lectures were printed in the Exp. 1906-1913. **Hall's** treatment of the character and use of the Psalter is intended to contribute toward the practical scheme of Revision of the Prayer Book, now being considered in the United States. A summary of scholarly conclusions is briefly presented. **Hastings' Great Texts** are homiletical. **Haupt** translates Psalms 132, with emendation of text, and makes an exegetical study. **Herzog** thinks the psalm can be retouched to remove most of the obscurities. The words of the curse belong not to the speaker but to his opponent. **Hirsch**—Third unaltered edition. Two parts in one volume. **Jayne**—Practical changes in the Church use of the Psalter are suggested. **Jeannotte** shows the importance of the citations made by St. Hilaire in reference to reconstructing the text current in Gaul in the middle of the fourteenth century. **Jetzinger** gives a brief instructive elucidation. **Jordon**—Studies in the Psalter based upon critical work. **Kent's** fifth volume of *The Student's Old Testament* is on the same plan as the rest of the series. **König** gives a critical treatment of Hebrew rhythm. **King** translates in the metre of the original; followed by exegetical study. **Kittel** contends especially against the extreme lateness of date defended by Duhm, and against Baethgen's interpretation of the bulk of the Psalms as Gemeindelieder. **Lyll** thinks both arose under like conditions and are closely similar to one another in content. **Maas** finds an extensive similarity in Arabic and Hebrew poetry and concludes therefore that they are of the same date. **Maddox** decides the psalm expresses an antagonism against the cult of High-Places. "If I raise my eyes to the high Altars, no help would come to me." **McFadyen**—The psalmists feel their homelessness in this world, but even here there may be such a thing as the happy man who has faith in the ultimate triumph of God's purposes. **McLean** protests against Dr. Barnes' treatment of the evidence of the ancient versions of Psalms 97 : 11, and his attack on the critical notes

of Wellhausen and Kittel. **Nairne** translates: "Before your pots feel the thorns you have lighted beneath them, swift as life, swift as wrath, He shall storm the whole thing away." **Peters** criticizes Kent's book (Student's Old Testament) at length as a prevalently erroneous conception of the nature and origin of Hebrew psalmody. In the JBL³⁵ he decides that the Psalms are intended primarily for ritual use. **Pratt** discusses in detail the Elohist and Yahwistic Pss. **Prothero**—New and enlarged fourth edition. **Rothstein** contributes to the metre, criticism and exegesis of the Old Testament. A reply to Stärk who criticized his former work. Thesis: A plea for a mixed metre. **Schlögl**—The first volume of a much needed and ambitious scientific work along Catholic lines. The completed work will comprise four volumes, consisting of eighteen parts. The success of this first volume will undoubtedly extend the knowledge of the Old Testament in Catholic circles. **Schroeder** thinks vs. 2-7 are an early sun-hymn which was revised for Jewish use. In his other article *v.* 15 is to be transferred and understood as omen. **Seiple**—A scholarly study with critical notes on Hebrew text. The conditions distinctly presuppose the Regency of Ptolemäus Philadelphus. **Thackeray**—Three lectures of a homiletical nature. In regard to Psalm 76, he maintains that the arrangements of the Jewish ecclesiastical calendar constitute an important factor in exegesis, since liturgical use influenced and modified the text in its transmission (*Cf.* Barnes, pp. 431-432). Concerning the Song of Hannah, etc., he puts together some notes on scriptural passages which were associated with the New Year festival, with the endeavor to reconstruct the first and second lessons for that day. He also shows reasons for believing that the Psalter was arranged for a triennial cycle. **Tholhofer**—Eighth edition, improved. **Van Koeverden** translates Psalm 39 stressing the strophic arrangement, with critical notes. **Wiesmann** concludes that Psalms 15:4c was originally Psalms 24:4c. Translates, with critical notes. In Psalm 91 he establishes a strophic arrangement. Places vs. 14-16 between vs. 3 and 4.

Wikenhauser—The oldest evidence of stenography. **Zorell's** *Einführung* is a scholarly study in this field by a most cautious student of Hebrew versification.

VII. d. 5. b. *Job*

- CARR, A., 'The Patience of Job (St. James 5 : 11)', Exp. 6, 511-517.
 CHESTERON, G. K., *The Book of Job*, London: Cecil Palmer & Hayward.
 HAZELTON, G. W., 'The Book of Job—Who wrote it?', BS71, 573-581.
 HEERBOTH, L. A., 'Das Bekenntnis Hiobs: Hiob 19 : 25-27', Lehre u. Wehre, 1915, I, 1-17; 3, 67-71.
 HUMBERT, P., 'Le poète de Job', RTP1914, 161-177.
 KING, E. G., *The Poem of Job translated in the Metre of the Original*, Cambridge: Univ. Pr., 1914, pp. xii+116.
 KING, E. G., 'Job and the Alphabetical Psalms', Interp.14, 31-39.
 KÖBERLE, J., *Das Rätsel des Leidens*, Berlin-Lichterfelde: Runge, 1914, pp. 32.
 MARTIN, A. D., 'The Book of Job', ET26, 75-81.
 NAHAPETIAN, G., 'Il commentario a Goibbe di Esichio, prete di Gerusalemme', Bessarione, 29, 452-465.
 NOYES, G. A., *Job*, London: Luzac, 1915.
 PETERS, N., *Die Weisheitsbücher des A. T.*, pp. x+295.
 PLADRA, O., *Die dichterische und religiöse Bedeutung des Buches Hiob, eine Anregung zum Studium des Buches*, Langensalza: Beyer, 1914, pp. 37.
 PROVENCE, S. M., 'The Book of Job. An Interpretation', Rev. and Exp. 13, 201-213.
 ROYDS, T. F., 'Job and the Problem of Suffering', Interp.11, 378-387.
 SCHRÖER, K., *Das Buch Uioh. Frei nach der alt. Dichtung*, Berlin: Müller, 1915.
 SIDERSKY, D., 'Un passage astronomique du livre de Job', JAS11, Ser. 3, 501 f.

Carr emphasizes the importance of *ὑπομονή* in distinction from *μακροθυμία* which could not have been appropriate to the Old Testament Job. **Hazleton** decides that Moses' father-in-law brought the MS from Midian to Moses in the desert. **King's** system is based upon the accentuation. In the Introduction he explains the cast of characters. The translation is provided with explanatory notes. In his article he studies the relation between Job and the Alphabetical Psalms which represent the teaching against which the Book of Job is written. **Köberle's** book is an introduction to the study of Job. This is the second unaltered edition. **Martin** concludes that suffering may be creational. **Nahapetian** compiles the notices concerning Hesychius and his commentary which P. Tscherakian had premised to his publication. **Noyes** translates the Book of

Job—"The effort is made to get a close metrical approximation and to present the same number of syllables in each line of the English as the Hebrew." (S. A. Cook, JTS18, 347.) **Peters**—A good translation with exegesis. **Pladra**—A suggestion for the study of the book. **Royds'** essay is written on the theme that suffering is necessarily involved in the attainment of greater general good. **Sidersky** points out that in Job 26 : 7 נָמַךְ should be translated not "to stretch out" but "to incline"—"he inclines the axis of the earth over the void." The author of Job also knew the declination of the ecliptic.

VII. d. 5. c. *Proverbs*

- ELMSLIE, W. A. L., *Studies in Life from Jewish Proverbs*, London: J. Clark & Co., 1916 (?), pp. 284.
 HUDAL, A., *Die relig. und sittl. Ideen des Spruchbuches*. Rom: Scripta pontificii instituti biblici, 1914, pp. xxviii+261.
 MEZZACASA, G., *Il Libro dei Proverbi di S.*, Roma, 1914.
 SCHÜTZE, 'Zu Sprüche 14 : 34', StKr1915, 367-370.
 ZENNER-WIESMANN, 'Das Buch der Sprüche. Kap.5', BZ12, 14-21.

Elmslie's study of the Wisdom teaching in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes breaks no new ground, but endeavors to bring the Proverbs into connection with the history of the Hellenistic period. **Hudal**—A critical and exegetical study. **Mezzacasa** is good in this field. **Schütze** translation, "Justice will exalt a nation, nevertheless the people love injustice."

VII. d. 5. d. *Megilloth*

- ACKERMAN, H. C., 'The Problem of Ecclesiastes', BW48, 83-88.
 BERRY, G. R., 'The Purpose of the Book of Ecclesiastes', Rev. and Exp. 13, 88-97.
 DEVINE, M., *Ecclesiastes*, Macmillan, 1916, pp. viii+237.
 DUFF, A., 'The Date of the Book of Lamentations', Interp.12, 284-297.
 ERFER, F., *Die Gottesbraut. Betrachtungen und Erwägungen über das Hohe Lied*, St. Ottilien: Missionsdruckerei, 1915, pp. x+309.
 GOEBEL, M., *Die Bearbeitungen des Hohen Liedes im 17. Jahrh.*, Leipzig, 1914, pp. 141.
 HALLER, M., *Esther* (Schriften des A. T. in Auswahl III, 262-279), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914.
 JETZINGER, F., 'Sprachliche Bemerkungen zum Hohen Lied', TPQ68, 303-314.
 JAYNE, A. G., 'The Book of Esther', Interp.11, 50-64.
 KAMENETZKY, A. S., 'Der Rätselname Koheleth', ZAW34, 225-228.

- LITTLE, G. O., 'Addition to the Sum of Revelation, found in the Book of Esther', BS71, 19-37.
 PATERSON, W. P., 'A Sage among the Prophets', ET26, 105-110.
 PESENTI, G., 'La fortuna di un epigramma misogino e alcuni versetti del-l'Ecclesiaste', Didaskaleion, 3, 321-326.
 PLATE, F., 'Die Lebensanschauung des Buches "Prediger Salomo"', Reformation, 1914, 38, 446-451.

Ackerman attempts to restate the moral problem of the book in a strictly philosophical manner, and suggests a solution. **Berry's** point is to show the failure of philosophy to solve the problems of existence. **Devine's** book is adapted more for the general reader than for scholars; not a commentary, but a sympathetic study of an experience. The integrity of Q is upheld; otherwise the position of Plumptre and Delitzsch is followed. **Duff** gives a series of arguments pointing toward the century just before the birth of Christ as the time of composition of the Lamentation Chants. **Erfer** pursues the typical allegorical conception (TPQ68, 377f.). **Goebel**—A dissertation. **Haller** translates and analyzes with explanatory remarks. The whole book is a genuine oriental Harem-story and at the same time the ritual-'sage' of the Purim feast. **Jetzinger** makes grammatical notes on the Latin text of Ct. of less known words, proper names and particular phrases which should facilitate a reading of the booklet. (BZ1915, 284.). **Jayne's** essay is to show the real and permanent value of Esther as a necessary link in the chain between the revelation of the Old Testament and New Testament. Esther supplies the necessary picture of the worldly and unlovely background. **Kamenetzky**—קהלת is selected as a name for Solomon because the word קהל is used so often by the Chronicler in connection with him. Therefore composed subsequent to the Chronicles. **Paterson**—The scepticism of Ecclesiastes consisted chiefly in refraining from a profession of knowledge of the Almighty as fully as others claimed to know him.

VII. d. 5. e. *Daniel*

- CHARLES, R. H., *The Book of Daniel*, New York: H. Frowde, 1915, pp. xiv+152.
 GÖTTESBERGER, J., 'Dn 3 und Tob 1 mit textkritischen Apparat', BZ13, 1-22.

- HOOPER, E. B., *Daniel and the Maccabees*, London: C. W. Daniel, 1917.
 WILSON, R. D., *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, New York: Putnam's Sons, 1917,
 pp. xvi+402.
 WINTERBOTHAM, R., 'The Third Chapter of Daniel', ET28, 167-169.

Charles in the introduction discusses, among other things, points in common between prophecy and apocalyptic. He summarizes why the latter became pseudonymous. He also treats of the ethical character of apocalyptic. The New-Century Bible. **Hooper** makes a good critical study. **Wilson's** studies are an ultra-conservative defense of the historicity of Daniel. The first few chapters are well treated but on account of the habit of building upon mere probabilities the reader loses confidence in the conclusions arrived at. **Winterbotham** illustrates that the Holy Spirit of inspiration is first concerned with the character and principles of action.

VIII. APOCRYPHA

- COHN, 'Die Welschöpfung in der Sapienz', (*Festschr. Guttman*).
 ELHORST, H. J., 'Het bock der Wijsheid van Salomo', NTT3, 1-21.
 HARWELL, R. K., The Principle Versions of Baruch, Yale Univ., 1915, pp. 66.
 JAMES, M. R., 'Notes on Apocrypha', JTS16, 403-413.
 OESTERLEY, W. O. E., The Books of the Apocrypha, London: Robert Scott, 1914, pp. xiv+553.
 OESTERLEY, W. O. E., The Wisdom of Ben-Sira, London: SPCK, 1916, pp. 148.
 OESTERLEY, W. O. E., The Wisdom of Solomon, London: SPCK, 1917, pp. xxiii+94.
 RISBERG, B., 'Textkritische und exegetische Anmerkungen zu den Makkabäerbüchern', Beitr. z. Religionswiss. 2, 6-31.
 SCHMITT, 'Der weise Achikar der morgenländischen Sage und der Achikar des Buches Tobias nach der Übersetzung der Siebenzig', Pastor bonus, 26, 83-90.

Cohn—Wisdom (no personification) teaches Creation out of matter, but a kind which the author conceives as wholly original—thus removing a contradiction. **Elhorst** takes exception to Focke's hypothesis (Cf. Focke, *Die Entstehung des Weisheit Salomos*. 1913). Chapters 1-5 and 6-19 are from the same hand. **Harwell's** dissertation shows that the whole book was written originally in Hebrew. The Greek version, made by a single hand early, has suffered much corruption.

The present text is late. The Old Syriac version was originally made from the Greek. Two Latin translations were made. A pre-Christian date is given for the Greek translation. **Oesterley's** valuable book will be appreciated by the general reader as well as the scholar. It is a very practical exposition of the origin, teaching and contents of the Apoc. books. The increasing interest in this field makes this timely work of great importance. It shows clearly how the Hellenistic movement synchronized with the entire period during which this particular kind of literature was produced. The introductory chapters are especially valuable and indispensable for Old Testament students. His other two little books mentioned belong to the series now being brought forth relating to the study of Christian origins. The object is to provide short, cheap and handy text-books for students, with the aim to furnish in translation the texts unencumbered by commentary or elaborate notes which can be had in larger works. It is proposed to publish three series: Palestinian—Jewish and cognate texts (pre-Rabbinic); Hellenistic—Jewish texts; and Palestinian and cognate texts (Rabbinic). So far eleven have appeared. **Risberg**—Exegetical study. The IJA of 1914-1917 also contains interesting and valuable short articles on the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

IX. PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

- BARRY, 'The Apocalypse of Ezra', JBL32, 261-272.
 BOX, G. H., *The Apocalypse of Ezra*, London: SPCK, 1917, pp. xv+114.
 BOUQUET, A. C., 'Why is the Book of Enoch so important?', Interp.11, 206-211.
 CHARLES, R. H., *The Apocalypse of Baruch, and the Assumption of Moses*, London: SPCK, 1917, pp. xxxiii+96+42.
 CHARLES, R. H., *The Book of Enoch*, 1917, pp. xxviii+154.
 CHARLES, R. H., *The Book of Jubilees*, 1917, pp. xxxiii+224.
 CHARLES, R. H., *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 1917, pp. xxiii+108.
 GRÉBAUT, 'Le miracles de l'archange Ragon'el', ROC18, 113-120.
 HARRIS, R. and MINGANA, A., *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*. Vol. I, Manchester: Univ. Pr., 1916, pp. xi+45, pls. 56.
 HEADLAM, A. C., 'The Ezra Apocalypse', CQR79, 288- .
 HUNKIN, J. W., 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', JTS16, 80-97.
 JAMES, M. R., *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo.*, London: SPCK, 1917, pp. vi+280.

- JAMES, M. R., 'The Apocryphal Ezekiel', JTS15, 236-243.
 JAMES, M. R., 'Ego Salathiel Qui et Ezras', JTS18, 167-169.
 KITTEL, G., *Die Oden Salomos überarbeitet oder einheitlich? Mit 2 Beilagen: I, Bibliographie der Oden Salomos; 2, Syrische Konkordanz der Oden Salomos*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914, pp. iv+180.
 KITTEL, G., 'Eine zweite Hs der Oden Salomos', ZNW14, 79-93.
 MINGANA, 'Quelques notes sur les Odes de Salomon', ZNW15, 234-253.
 SCHULTE, A. V., *Beiträge zur Erklärung und Textkritik des Buches Tobias*, Freiburg: Herder, 1914, pp. viii+146.
 SMITH, P., 'Disciples of John and Odes of Solomon', Monist, 1915, Apr.
 THACKERAY, H. St. J., *The Letter of Aristeas*, London: SPCK, 1917, pp. xx+116.
 TONDELLI, L., *Le odi di Salomone; Cantici cristiani degli inizi del II secolo. Versione dal siriano, introduzione e note*, Rom: Ferrari, 1914, pp. 270.

Barry dates the last redaction 96-120 A. D. The kernel of the work consists of a lost Hadrian-Apocalypse. Bouquet answers the question in his essay thus, "Because ours is an 'apocalyptic' age." Charles begins the series of late Jewish writings by editing the two apocalypses. (Cf. note on this edition upon Apocrypha.) Grébaut begins the publication of the MS Delorme No. 3 (Ethiopic text). The legend treats of Joshua's command to the sun, the appearance of the angel to Balaam and the leading of the wise men to Bethlehem. Harris and Mingana re-edit the Odes with text and facsimile and photographic reproductions. Headlam points out the strain of poetry running through the whole work in the midst of certain literary elements which are tiresome and trivial. Hunkin investigates the text, challenging in detail some of the weaknesses of Charles' position. James—The book belongs to the series of late Jewish writings mentioned above. His article in the JTS15 is an attempt to collect all pieces which spring from an apocryphon and are ascribed to Ezekiel. A passage in Epiphanius makes clear that this book has a separate existence and did not consist merely of additions to the canonical book. In regard to the Haggadic confusion of Assir with Ezra, James points out that such identifications were rife among Jewish scholars and made very light-heartedly. Kittel's helpful study of the Odes is intended to prove that they are wholly Christian in origin. It is an excellent critical discussion in the light of the

work done by other scholars, with a full bibliography of the Odes. In his article he compares the MS found by Burkitt with the Harris text so far as the translation is influenced, with the result: both texts are MSS of one and the same translation and go back independently to a common Syrian foundation. **Schulte** makes a concise and exhaustive study of the text, and discusses the question of its inspiration. A full translation is included with introductory remarks of a most conservative character. The exegetical notes vary in value. **Tondelli** dates the Odes ca. 120 A. D. They were composed in Greek on Egyptian soil and then translated into Coptic and Syriac. They are essentially orthodox although they incline somewhat to the Gnostic rationalism.

X. RELIGION. *a. General*

- AALDERS, G. C., 'Sporen van animisme in het O. T.?' Geref. theol. Tijdschr. Kampen: Kok, 1914, 378-383.
- ABEL, F., 'Saint Jérôme et les prophéties messianiques', RB, 1916, 421-440; 1917, 247-269.
- ALEXANDER, A. B. D., *Christianity and Ethics*, New York: Scribner's, 1914, pp. xii+257.
- BARTON, G. A., *The Religions of the World*, Chicago: Univ. Chi. Pr., 1917, pp. xi+349.
- BATLEY, J. Y., *The problem of Suffering in the Old Testament*, Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1916, pp. 200.
- BEECHING, H. C., *Inspiration*, London: SPCK, 1914, pp. 38.
- BEET, J. A., 'The Hereafter in the Bible and in Modern Thought', HJ12, 837-855.
- BENAMOZEGH, E., *Israel et l'humanité*, Paris: Leroux, 1914, pp. xliii+735.
- BERTHOLET, A., *Die israelitischen Vorstellungen von Zustand nach Tode*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1914, pp. iv+58.
- BINDLEY, T. H., 'What ought we to understand by the Inspiration of the Bible?', Interp.10, 268-277.
- BUNZEL, U., *Der Begriff der Heiligkeit im A. T.*, Breslau, pp. 52.
- COOK, S. A., *The Study of Religions*, London: A. & C. Black, 1914, pp. xxiv+439.
- DAVIES, T. W., 'The Words "Witch" and "Witchcraft": Their Proper and Improper Use in History and Literature', Exp. 8, 19-29.
- Die Theologie des Gegenwart*, vii 2 u. viii 3 (AT von E. Sellin), Leipzig: Deichert, 1914, pp. 119-157; 137-160.
- DÖLLER, J., *Das Gebet im A. T.*, in *religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, Wien: Buchh. 'Reichspost', 1914, pp. 107.
- FOWLER, H. T., *The Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion*, Chicago: Univ. Pr., 1916, pp. xi+190.
- GRAY, G. B., 'Interpretations of Jewish Sacrifice', Exp. 9, 385-404.

- GRAY, G. B., 'The Antiquity and Perpetuity of Sacrifice', Exp. 9, 528-552.
- GRAY, G. B., 'The Sacrifice of Cain and Abel', Exp. 10, 1-23.
- GREIFF, A., *Das Gebet im A. T.*, Vol. V, Pt. 3 (Abh. Hrsg. von J. Nickel), pp. viii + 144.
- GRENSTED, L. W., 'Immortality in the O. T.', Interp. 11, 169-179.
- HAMILTON, H. F., *Discovery and Revelation*, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1915, pp. xii + 196.
- HOBERG, G., *Katechismus der messianischen Weissagungen*, Freiburg: Herder, 1915, pp. xii + 112.
- HOOKE, S. H., 'Gog and Magog', ET 26, 317-319.
- HUTTON, J. A., 'From Jahweh to Elohim: From the Particular to the Universal', Exp. 13, 454-460.
- JIRKU, A., *Materialien zur Volksreligion Israels*, Leipzig: Deichert, 1914, pp. viii + 150.
- JIRKU, A., *Die magische Bedeutung der Kleidung in Israel*, Rostock: Adler, 1914, pp. 34.
- JORDAN, L. H., *Comparative Religion. Its Adjuncts and Allies*, Humfrey Milford, 1915, pp. xxxii + 574.
- KENNETT, R. H., 'Satan', Interp. 11, 26-33.
- KIRKPATRICK, S. C., *Through the Jews to God*, London: SPCK, 1916, pp. ix + 157.
- KÖHLER, K., 'The Sabbath and Festivals in Pre-exilic and Exilic Times', JAOS 373, 209-223.
- KÖNIG, E., 'Volksreligion überhaupt und speziell bei den Hebräern', ARW 17, 35-63.
- KÖNIG, E., 'Image Worship and Idol Worship in the Old Testament', Exp. 7, 289-298.
- KÖNIG, E., 'Der Leidensgedanke in den messianischen Weissagungen', Reformation, 1915, 13, 146-148.
- LEGGE, F., *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*, Vol. I-II, Cambridge: Univ. Pr., 1915, pp. lxiii + 202.
- LEMONNYER, A., 'Achima', RSPT 8, 284-296.
- LJUNGGREN, L. O., *Böner i Gamla Testamentet*, Lund: Cleerup, 1914, xi + 458.
- LÖHR, M., 'Kultur und Religion im alten Israel', Geisteswiss. I., 37 f., 1011-1014, 1038-1043.
- MACKINTOSH, H. R., 'Eschatology in the Old Testament and Judaism', Exp. 10, 47-65.
- MARTI, K., *Die Religion des A. T. unter den Religionen des vorderen Orients*, Tokio, 1914, pp. xxxiii + 361.
- MCCLELLAN, J. B., 'Redemption, Salvation and Atonement in the Old and New Testaments', Exp. 11, 107-122.
- MEEK, T. J., 'The Sabbath in the Old Testament (Its Origin and Development)', JBL 33, 201-212.
- MOERING, E., *Theophanien und Träume in der biblischen Literatur*, Heidelberg, 1914, pp. 54.
- MONTGOMERY, J. A., 'The Characteristic of Sublimity in the Old Testament', BW 46, 293-300.

- MORGENSTERN, J., 'The Etymological History of the Three Hebrew Synonyms for "to dance", HGG, HLL and KRR, and their Cultural Significance', JAOS36, 321-332.
- MOZLEY, J. K., *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, New York: Scribner's, 1916, pp. vii+235.
- NAIRNE, A., *The Faith of the Old Testament*, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1914, pp. ix+226.
- NOTSCHER, F., *Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes* (Abhandl. Alttest. vi, I).
- PETERS, J. P., *The Religion of the Hebrews*, Boston: Ginn & Co., 1914, pp. xii+502.
- RANKIN, H. W., 'Philosophy and the Problem of Revelation', PTR13, 409-460; 14, 265-311.
- REILLY, W. S., 'L'Inspiration de l'Ancien Testament chez Saint Irénée', RB1917, 489-507.
- RIES, T. *The Holy Spirit*, New York: Scribner's, 1915, pp. ix+221.
- ROSS, J. M. E., 'The Preaching of Justice', ET27, 537-540.
- SAROWY, 'Der Animismus im A. T.', Stst12, 100-107, 162-170.
- SCHULZ, A., *Die sittliche Wertung des Krieges im A. T.*, Münster: Aschendorff, 1915, pp. 47.
- SKIBNIEWSKI, M., 'Ethnologische Woche in Löwen (Semaine d'ethnologie religieuse)', ZKT38, 379-384.
- SMITH, H. P., *The Religion of Israel*, New York: Scribner's, 1914, pp. x+369.
- SMITH, J. M. P., 'The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament', BW49-50, *passim*.
- STAVE, E., 'Folkmacht och Kungamakt i Israel', Bibelforskaren, 1914, 3.
- TAYLOR, W. C., 'Moral Difficulties in the Old Testament', Rev. and Exp. 13, 388-396.
- WARFIELD, B. B., 'The Divine Messiah of the Old Testament', PTR14, 369-416.
- WATSON, W., 'The Human and the Superhuman Messiahs', Exp. 13, 63-80.
- WATSON, W., 'The Fear of God', ET25, 234 f.
- WATSON, W., 'The Last Judgment', ET27, 316-319.
- WATSON, A. S., *The Cherubim and the Throne*, London: Morgan, 1914, pp. 122.
- WHITTEKER, J. E., 'The Old Testament in Doctrine and Life', LCR36, 201-206.
- WICKS, H. J., *The Doctrine of God*, London: Hunter & Longhurst, 1915, pp. x+371.
- WIGAND, K., 'Die altisraelitische Vorstellung von unreinen Tieren', ARW17, 413-436.
- WILLETT, H. J., 'The Religion and Social Ideals of Israel', BW46-47, *passim*.

Abel illustrates predictive prophecy from the Roman Catholic point of view. Alexander in chapter 3 briefly discusses the ethical thought of Israel under the captions, Law, Prophecy, and Poetry. Barton includes a summary sketch of the religion of the ancient Hebrews and Judaism to complete the general scheme. Batley traces the various doctrines of suffering in the

Old Testament and decides that the teaching is left incomplete when read in the light of other writings but has a real and lasting value. **Beeching**—Three Advent lectures given in Norwich Cathedral—of a popular nature. **Beet** concludes that the thought of requital after death sprung up in Judaism through relation with Hellenistic culture. **Benamozegh** conceives a thoroughly reformed Judaism to be the ideal of the universal religion. **Bertholet**—Second edition, much improved and amplified. **Bindley** defines inspiration as that quality which stirs the divinest thing in us, *i. e.*, a matter of feeling and indefinable. **Bunzel's** dissertation investigates the ideas of holiness in their historical development in the Old Testament. It is to serve merely as an introduction to a more complete work to follow. **Cook's** very closely reasoned discussion on comparative religion maintains that the religious whole "at any given moment contains the essential, the persisting and the developing, together with the non-essential and transitory." Old Testament religious culture necessarily receives a large share of attention. **Davies'** study of witchcraft is important in its bearing on the Old Testament. The chief value of **Döller's** book is the help to understand this field through extra-biblical parallels. The Psalter represents both individual and collective prayers; the 'curse-psalm' only applies to sinners—all else is poetical wording. **Fowler's** handy little book in modern vein is for the use of teachers and students as a practical guide in the study of Israel's religion. **Gray's** discussion aims to find the rationale of sacrifice. In Exp. 9, 526 ff.—stress of circumstances has invalidated with some Jewish authorities the divine command to maintain sacrifice as an everlasting ordinance. In Exp. 10, 1 ff.—the preference for animal over vegetable sacrifice was the most significant feature of the system. **Greiff**—An enlarged dissertation: (1) Etymology and Use of the Hebrew expression for prayer; (2) Archæology; (3) Development; (4) Ideal development or theology. **Grensted**—No provision is made in the Old Testament for a complete study of the doctrine. A later day brought the problem into relation

with the love of God. The teaching of Genesis 2 that the soul came from and returned to God was inconsistent with the Sheol doctrine and led the Sadducees to deny immortality. After Jeremiah's emphasis upon individual worth, much more was made of the doctrine of immortality to solve the problem of God's justice. **Hamilton's** short and popular outline of the argument in the first volume of his larger work, *The People of God*, reveals the distinction between the knowledge of God derived by the exercise of our faculties and that imparted directly by God. Important for the study of Comparative Religion. **Hoberg's** very practical little book will be useful for both teacher and student. Much space is devoted to the Hebrew, Greek and Latin text with variations. Full exegesis is given, covering the whole ground. **Hooke**—"Even the old Messianic hope and kingdom cannot finally purge the earth of evil and end the age-long conflict." God alone must do it by intervention. **Hutton**—Homiletical, based upon comparisons of the local and national and the universal and ethical spirit of Psalms 14 and 53. **Jirku** makes a study of magic elements of the Old Testament. **Jordan's** work contains a valuable series of reviews of recent books, many of which bear upon the religion of the Old Testament. **Kennett**—The personification of the trials which distinguish the good and true from the bad and false is equivalent to Satan. **Kirkpatrick's** work is an able attempt to draw Christians into greater sympathy with Jews by a compilation of facts concerning Judaism. Indispensable for a proper realization of the background of Christianity. **Köhler** by a method of historical-critical research rather than by consultation of the codes of law arrives at an altogether different calendar system in ancient Israel. **König** determines the idea of folk-religion as a complex of religious views of a people in contradistinction to individual thinkers. That of the Hebrews is considered in relation to the official religion. The Elephantine papyrus is used to support his view. In Exp. 7 he writes against Kyle (*cf. Sunday School Times*, 1913, September) who maintained that the worship of the golden calves, Ex. 32,

was idolatrous. Both kinds of adoration are to be distinguished, although the Old Testament here and there treats the images of God as really God. **Legge's** thorough and scholarly book consists of studies in religious history from 330 B. C. to 330 A. D. Judaism is not fully treated since it was not a real competitor of infant Christianity, the effective rivals being the Oriental Religions, Manichæism and Gnosticism. **Lemonnyer** concludes that uncertainty still prevails regarding this goddess in spite of the illumination of the Elephantine Papyri. **Ljunggren**—A detailed treatment of the invocation, subject, need, foundation, form and the circumstances of prayer, with the Hebrew expressions for prayer in pre-prophetic times. The same scheme is employed with regard to the post-exilic period. **Löhr** shows what elements of civilization influenced the course of Israelite religion, and how they persist to the present day. **Mackintosh** surveys broadly this subject in respect to the community and also as touching the individual. Certain theological conclusions are drawn from the historical development. **Marti's** book is translated into Japanese by K. Maejima. **McClellan** distinguished the broad differences between the thought of the Old and New Testament. **Moering**—A dissertation. **Montgomery**—To see *sub specie aternitatis* that God alone is great is the key to the sublimity of Hebrew thought and diction. **Morgenstern's** article is important for a further study of dancing rites in early Semitic religion, the principle of taboo, the various agricultural festivals and the deities thus honored. **Mozley's** book is primarily historical and descriptive. The first chapter is devoted to the Old Testament conception (reconciliation and reparation) as the substratum of Christian doctrine. There is no perfect synthesis of prophetic and priestly views. **Nairne** writes in a devotional spirit, but underrates the importance of critical study. This first volume in *The Layman's Library* series aims to make religious points at issue clear and lucid to the average intelligence. It is characterized in general by sound judgment and attractively written. **Peters'** book is one of the most excellent works in this

line. Indispensable to the Old Testament student. **Rankin** reviews the forms of Bible revelation, and in a brilliant way reveals the fundamental connection between these and different philosophical systems. He thus advocates the union of Christian theology and philosophy by pointing out certain aspects of the Scriptural view of God which no philosopher can afford to miss. **Reilly**—All the ancient Scriptures were considered as a divine oracle issuing from a divine intelligence, and having their meaning in that which they signified to the mind of God. The distinction between inspiration and revelation was unknown in the second century. **Ries**—See chapters 1-3 for the Old Testament conception of The Spirit. No formulated doctrine. **Ross** points out that the ideal of justice gripped the conscience of the Law-givers as well as that of the prophets. **Sarowv** concludes that although Israel took over some animistic tendencies from the Canaanite religion, still the fundamental elements are wanting in the Old Testament. **Schulz**—Second edition. **Skibniewski** alludes in a valuable way to the Bible viewpoint. **Smith** writes an historical study of Israelite religion from its beginnings in the nomadic period to the nation's downfall, which is characterized by sound learning and original insight. Indispensable for students of Old Testament theology. 'The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament' is worked out in outline by **J. M. P. Smith** as a study course of the American Institute of Sacred Literature. **Taylor** seeks a principle by which the moral difficulties may be accepted in accord with an enlightened conscience. **Walker** shows affinities between the two religions. Persian influence "assisted the crystallization and systematization of pre-existing conceptions regarding angeology and demonology." **Warfield** illustrates how the Old Testament testifies to the divinity of the Messianic ideal. **Watson** distinguishes between two Jewish conceptions of the Messiah: the human, being born of human parents and not being pre-existent; and the super-human, being pre-existent and descending marvelously out of heaven. In the ET25 he arranges systematically the Biblical evidence concerning the

fear of God. In ET27 the growth and ramifications of the forensic conception of judgment are traced. **Whitaker** is conservative and traditional. **Wicks** pursues the ideas of God's transcendence in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic literature. Valuable contribution to this subject. **Wigand** sees in Israel the same tendency to limit the enjoyment of eating flesh manifest in the records of other ancient peoples. **Willett** writes an outline Bible-Study Course for the American Institute of Sacred Literature.

x. b. *Yahwism*

- BAUDISSIN, W. W., 'Zur Geschichte des Monotheismus bei semitischen Völkern', DLZ35, 5-13.
- DADOUX, C. J., 'The Ethics of a Hebrew Lawyer', *Interp.* 12, 158-119.
- CORNILL, C. H., 'Zum Segen Jakobs und zum jahwistischen Dekalog', (Wellh. *Festschr.* 101-113).
- DELPORTE, L., 'L'anathème de Jahvé. Recherches sur le Herem préexilien en Israel', RSR5, 297-328.
- DRIESEN, E., 'Studien over godsdienst van Israël', Kotholick, 1914, Mai 415-429.
- EISSFELDT, O., *Israels Geschichte*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1914, pp. 52.
- EISSFELDT, 'Jahwe und Baal', Preuss. Jahrbücher, 155, 257-270.
- ELHORST, H. J., 'Die israelitischen Traueritten', (Wellh. *Festschr.* 115-128).
- GALL, A. v., 'Über die Herkunft der Bezeichnung Jahwes als König', (Wellh. *Festschr.* 147-160).
- GLASENAPP, G. V., *Der Yahwismus als Gottesvorstellung*, Weimar: Roelsch, 1915, pp. iii+64.
- JAHN, G., *Über den Gottesbegriff der Alten Hebraeer und ihre Geschichtschreibung*, Leiden: Brill, 1915, pp. xiii+672.
- JASTROW, M., *Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions* (The Haskell Lectures), New York: Scribner's, 1914, pp. xv+376.
- LESZYNSKY, R., 'Der Neue Bund in Damaskus', *Jahrb. f. jüd. Gesch.* 97-125.
- LODS, A., 'L'Ange de Yahvé et "l'âme extérieure"', (Wellh. *Festschr.* 263-669).
- MEINHOLD, J., 'Der Grosse Versöhnungstag der Israeliten', *Geisteswiss.* 1913-1914, 143-146.
- MEINHOLD, J., 'Zur Frage der Kultuszentralisation', (Wellh. *Festschr.* 299-317).
- MORGENSTERN, J., 'The Bones of the Paschal Lamb', *JAOS* 36, 146-153.
- MORGENSTERN, J., 'Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals', *JQR* 8, 31-54.
- MORGENSTERN, J., 'The Origin of Massoth and the Massoth-Festival', *AJT* 21, 275-293.
- PATON, L. B., 'Canaanite Influence on the Religion of Israel', *AJT* 18, 205-224.
- RIDDERBOS, J., *Israel en de Baäls Afval of Ontwikkeling*, Nijverdal: Bosch, 1915, pp. 95.
- SCHEFTELOWITZ, I., 'Die sündentilgung durch Wasser', *ARI* 7, 354-412.

- RIESSLER, P., 'Das Moseslied und der Mosessegen. II. Der Mosessegen', BZ12, 125-141.
- SMITH, J. M. P., 'The Effect of the Disruption on the Hebrew Thought of God', AJSL1916, 261-269.
- SMITH, J. M. P., 'Religion and War in Israel', AJT19, 17-31.
- STEUERNAGEL, C., 'Jahwe, der Gott Israels. Eine Stil- und religionsgeschichtliche Studie', (Wellh. Festschr. 329-351).
- VAN HOONACKER, A., 'La date de l'introduction de l'encens dans le culte de Jahvé', RB1914, 161-187.
- VÖLTER, D., *Jahwe und Mose*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1914, pp. 48.
- WALLIS, L., 'Amorite Influence in the Religion of the Bible', BW45, 216-223.
- WATERMAN, L., 'Bull-Worship in Israel', AJSL1915, 229-255.

Baudissin replies to Hehn. **Cadoux** cites cases in Hebrew law to show the combination of inconsistent elements due to the retention of usages and superstitions sanctioned by a remote past and the incorporation of dawning sensibilities of a higher truth. **Cornill** makes a good observation, but is mostly given up to a literary quarrel with his opponents. **Delporte** attacks Stade's conception (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel* I, 489 ff.). He explains the pre-exilic bann as neither a vow nor an oblation; but there was a definitely bounded, sanctified locality within which Yahweh reserved for himself everything that was there. **Drielsen** traces the evolution of the Volksgodsdienst. **Eissfeldt's** compact and thoroughly critical book sets forth the principle events in the life of the Hebrews down to the exile, their religious and their political importance. **Eissfeldt** describes vividly the religious struggle, with numerous citations. **Elhorst** criticizes previous theories; but his own theory about subterranean Gods is questionable. **Gaster** thinks the original meaning of Lord of Hosts was lost before it was applied to Yah. **Gall**—This title became common after 586 B. C. Before, Yahweh was king of Sion, and succeeded to Zedek of Sion. **Glassenapp**—A religious-philosophical inquiry in the domain of the Old Testament. **Jahn** goes into detail concerning the question of the pre-Mosaic Yahweh. He makes use of Babylon and Assyrian texts in discussing the idea of God among the Semites and Hebrews. **Jastrow's** lectures here appear in a revised and enlarged form. The value of

Jastrow's work is well known. **Kent** classifies leaven as a type of corruption among the Hebrews. The custom of hurriedly eating unleavened food in the busy first week of harvest grew into an institution confirmed by the earliest Hebrew laws. **Leszynsky**—The documents belonged to an old Jewish sect in Damascus which was destroyed about 70 A. D. **Lods** believes that there are numerous examples in different religions of the existence of a belief in an 'exterior soul' to which the 'Angel of Jehovah' in the Old Testament corresponds. **Meinhold**—A history of the development of Sühnetage. In the *Festschr.* he discusses the cult of Yahweh at different stages. The tent had no independent cultural significance. **Morgenstern** discusses the probable origin and significance of this rite. In the JQR we have a paper prepared for a Festschrift, the publication of which was prevented by the war, in commemoration of the sixtieth birthday of Immanuel Löw, Rabbi at Szegedin, Hungary, a famous Semitic scholar. In the AJT, he attempts to show that the *Maṣṣoth*-Festival was originally an Astarte-Tammuz festival. **Paton**—Yahwism contracted much contamination in the conquest of Baalism. **Ridderbos's** rectorial address was delivered in the theological school of the Reformed Church of Holland at Nijverdal on December 7, 1915. It is a careful discussion (printed with full notes) of the gradual way in which the Israelite religion synchronized and developed. **Scheftelowitz**—A poetical idea, but commonly connected with the power of water. **Smith** makes the point that through the disruption Yahweh became the God of *two* nations, bitterly hostile to each other; which fact became subversive of the idea of a national God and generated the conception of impartiality. God thus dealt with men according to His own superior rather than their inferior and narrow purposes, and consequently extended His control beyond the double-Israel without limit. In the AJT he concludes war forced the Hebrews to think theologically and so quickened their spiritual vitality, and made Israel concern itself with inner and fundamental realities rather than with external things. **Steuernagel** tries

to prove that the name of 'Jahwe, der Gott Israels' means the God whom the people of Israel had chosen for their God. **Völter** suggests that the Mosaic Yahwism had its origin in the Egyptian religious beliefs of the time of Moses. **Van Hoonacker's** article is a thoughtful argument, on the basis of archæological research, against the late use of incense; and points out the difficulties involved in the late dating of **P. Wallis** shows that the Amorite polytheism was a strong support for aristocracy and special privilege. "The victory of monotheism was the first great triumph of democracy in the history of the world." **Waterman** attempts to prove that the bull-cult of Yahweh from the period of the Judges to the eighth century prophets was widespread and deep-seated, the most prominent interpreter of Yahweh.

X. c. Judaism

- BLAU, L., *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*, Berlin: Lamm, pp. viii+168.
 BOUSSET, W., *Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915, pp. iv+319.
 BURKITT, F. C., *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, London: British Academy, 1914, pp. vi+80.
 COOK, S. A., 'The Significance of the Elephantine Papyri for the History of Hebrew Religion', *AJT* 19, 346-382.
 CHARLES, R. H., *Religious Development between the Old and the New Testament*, London: Williams and Norgate, 1914, pp. 256.
 COHN, B., *Die Anfangsepoche des jüdischen Kalenders*, Berlin: Sitzungsher. der Akad. 1914, 350-354.
 DACHLER, A., 'Die Feuerungen der Juden im Zeitalter der Bibel und des Talmud', *Mitt. d. anthrop. Ges. in Wien*, 44, 136-151.
 DUJARDIN, E., *The Source of the Christian Tradition. A Critical History of Ancient Judaism*, Chicago: The Open Court Pub. Co., 1914, xvi+307.
 EERDMANS, B. D., 'Pharisees and Sadducees', *Exp.* 8, 299-315.
 GASTER, M., 'Jewish Coins and Messianic Traditions', *Exp.* 12, 241-259.
 GRESSMANN, H., 'Der Messiasglaube in der Geschichte der Völker', (*Deutsche Rundschau*, 159, 396-415).
 HALLER, M., *Das Judentum*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914, pp. xviii+310.
 HERTZ, J. H., 'Jewish Mysticism', *HJ* 14, 784-798.
 HUNKIN, J. W., 'Judas Maccabaeus and Prayers for the Dead', *Exp.* 9, 361-365.
 JOHANNES, 'Die Schaufäden bei den Juden', *ThPM* 25, 565-579.
 LILIENTALOWA, R., *Świeta żydowskie w przeszłości i teraźniejszości*, Krakaw: Ak. d. Wiss. Bd. 52, 1914.

- MARGOLIOUTH, G., 'III. The Marriage Law in the Geniza-Zadokite Documents', ET25, 560-564.
- MESSEL, N., *Die Einheitlichkeit der Jüdischen Eschatologie*, Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1915, pp. iv+188.
- MONTEFIORE, C. G., *Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays*, London: Goschen, 1914, pp. 240.
- MORIN, G., 'L'opuscule perdu du soi-disant Hégésippe sur les Machabées', Rbén 31, 83-91.
- OORT, H., *De Laatste Eeuwen van Israëls Volksbestaan*, Leiden: Doesburgh, 1915, pp. vii+382+417.
- OORT, H., 'Iets over Farrizeën en Sadduceën,' ThT1914, 214-230.
- PIEPENBRING, C., 'Le messianisme juif', RTP1914, 366-385.
- RAMSAY, W. M., 'The Old Testament in the Roman Phrygia', ET1915, Jan.
- RATTEY, B. K., 'The Apocalyptic Hope in the Maccabaeon Age', Interp.10, 190-201.
- ROGERS, E., 'Jewish Coins and Messianic Tradition. A Reply to Dr. Gaster', Exp. 13, 29-43.
- SEGAL, M. H., 'Pharisees and Sadducees', Exp. 13, 81-108.
- Soziale Ethik im Judentum*, Frankfurt: Kauffmann, 1914, pp. 135.
- SMITH, J. M. P., 'Jewish Religion in the Fifth Century B. c.', AJSL1917, 322-333.
- WENSINCK, A. J., 'Über das Weinen in den monotheistischen Religionen Vorderasiens', (Sachau Festschr. 26-35).
- WICKS, H. J., *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature*, London: Hunter & Longhurst, 1915, pp. xi+371.

Blau—New and enlarged edition. **Bousset's** book is important for the study of Judaism of the time of Christ. **Cook** makes a thorough study of the life of the Jewish colony at Elephantine, which supplements our Biblical sources during a period extraordinarily obscure. **Charles** treats very succinctly the Jewish literature that grew up between the Testaments, with brilliant summaries of authorship, dates and religious teaching. **Dujardin**—Revised edition, translated by J. McCabe. **Eerdmans** in an interesting study concludes that the Pharisees and Sadducees were both sects in the proper sense of the word, the latter representing the conservative and orthodox tendencies in Judaism and the former being more liberal minded, ready to adapt the old religion to new conditions. The Sadducees expected the Messianic kingdom on earth, the Pharisees looked for it in heaven (under the influence of non-Jewish ideas). The origin of the sects was eschatological. (Cf. Oort below.) **Gaster** decides in favor of

Simon Bar Kochba rather than Simon the Maccabean as an explanation of the type of Messianic symbols on the coins. (Cf. Rogers below.) **Gressmann** includes a short sketch upon the development of the Messianic hope in Judaism. Egypt, however, he thinks, is the birthplace of the original Messianic belief. **Haller's** work is a continuation of the *Die Schriften des Alten Testaments*, containing the historical writings, prophecies and law after the exile. It publishes the text in German translation, divided into sections with popular exposition. **Hertz'** historical survey is important for its reference to sources in early Judaism. **Hankin** decides there is no trustworthy evidence in 2 Macc. for the existence of the custom in the time of the Maccabees. The appearance of the developed custom of praying for the dead is Egyptian Judaism, ca. 2 B. C. due to Egyptian influence. **Lilientalowa** writes upon Jewish feast days past and present. **Margoliouth**—A critical study. **Messel** traces the development of Jewish Eschatology from period to period, showing how each stage of thought was a natural growth out of a preceding stage, independent of neighboring eschatologies. **Montefiore** points out that although Christianity is the complement of Judaism, still it is antithetical to it inasmuch as the fulfilment of the Law in Christ introduces a spirit of liberty which completely severs the two systems of religion. **Morin**—Hegesippus, who is to be identified with Nummius Amilianus Dexter, wrote in latin the 'Passio Maccabaorum'. **Oort**—A second enlarged edition of this famous work, first published in 1877, upon Judaism from the time of Nehemiah to the fall of Jerusalem. In the discussion between Oort and Eerdmans upon the Pharisees and Sadducees, cf. also **Segal** in Exp. 13, 81-108. **Rathey**—Apocalyptic literature served as the medium by which the prophetic Messianic ideal was transmuted into the Kingdom of God. Hope developed along two lines: the national ideal of a mighty warrior and a religious triumph through devotion to the Law. **Rogers** brings forward evidence to show that Gaster's conclusions cannot stand. **Segal** criticizes Eerdmans

theories. The Pharisees were not a sect but representative of the national religion. "The parent of Sadduceeism was *Judean Hellenism*." The *Soziale Ethik*, edited by an association of German Jews, is second edition. **Smith** compares the God-idea of the Egyptian Jews at Assuan, seen in the light of the Elephantine papyri, with the religion of the masses in Palestine and finds the two on much the same level. **Wensinck** states that weeping as a ceremony among the Jews is not as common as among Syrian Christians and Mohammedans. **Wicks** treats mainly of three subjects: the Transcendence, the Justice and the Grace of God.

CRITICAL NOTE

RECONCEPTUALIZATION AS A PRINCIPLE OF EXEGESIS

(e. g., Gen. 3: 1-6)

By H. C. ACKERMAN, Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wis.

A progressive age is inevitably partial to reinterpretations of HS which conform to its own peculiar mode of thinking. Modern reconstructive thought has evolved and formulated five principles of exegesis which are now universally adopted by all competent scholarship—*viz.*, authenticity, historicity, archaeological illumination, literary style, ideality (psychological predetermination).¹ There is, however, another principle of interpretation which a proper evaluation of HS necessitates if the message and meaning of the Bible is to reach the world in the most practical manner. This is the principle of reconceiving the rudimentary notions employed by earlier modes of thought. In addition to perennial reinterpretation there should be a reconstruction of the concepts in which the facts underlying primitive descriptions and explanations have been conserved. The *mere* meaning in the mind of the original author, however accurately determined, is inadequate today to satisfy scientific demands. Faulty concepts should be revised by the exegete to meet this need, *i.e.*, the need of reaching intelligently the fundamental realities in any particular situation. In brief, reconceptualization should precede reinterpretation.

The Semitic mind, with a predilection for the picturesque and the concrete, used concepts so weakly representative of the truth to be conveyed that they seldom amounted to more than the barest suggestion regarding the fundamental nature of the realities in question. Without elaborating

¹Cf. I. M. Price, BW47, 198-305.

this statement, let me indicate how the exegetical treatment suggested will affect the reading and understanding of a Scriptural passage. Take, for example, the account of the origin of evil in Gen. 3: 1-6. It is obvious that many mixed mythological speculations underlie the prophetic message of the final author.² It is consequently exceedingly doubtful whether the original meaning of this particular version of the "fall" can be recovered, and even if this were possible the rudimentary significance of the symbols employed would have but a small value in relation to the actual facts of the situation. These facts constitute the main desideratum of exegesis; and to apprehend them in a realistic manner it is necessary to substitute our own abstract ideas in the place of the original conceptions.

Perhaps the most accurate interpretation of the function of the serpent is the symbolization of carnal desires and the sexual appetite.³ But it is reasonable to suppose that this particular form of temptation receives here a generalization, to imply evil *quā* evil. The pitiable dearth of abstract notions and the limited powers of generalization render the serpent symbol inadequate to do justice to the elemental reality of evil. Hence the great diversity of interpretation.⁴

In order, therefore, to see deeper and more truly into primary experiences of evil with a view toward the elucidation of their problematic origin, we should approach the same circumstances by way of reconceptualization. This manner of exegesis, in the instance selected, will net the following results: (1) evil so far as sources are concerned is external to consciousness; (2) it arises out of nature (the material existence); (3) it approaches and touches man in most subtle and indefinable ways;⁵ (4) it enters consciousness through the

² Cf. L. Kessler, "Welche Deutung fordert die Geschichte vom Sündenfall ihrem Zusammenhang nach?", ZAW35, 26-44.

³ Cf. P. Haupt, "The Curse on the Serpent," JBL35, 155-162.

⁴ Vide J. Skinner, *Genesis, in loco*.

⁵ Note the subtlety (ערום) of the serpent, v.1.

most delicate sensibilities;⁶ (5) the evil stimuli (impressions, sensations, suggestions) arrive disorganized and uncoordinated, so that if they are permitted to function without due regulation and discipline the organism is naturally disturbed, *i.e.*, sins are generated;⁷ (6) elemental evil is physical and material;⁸ (7) evil originates outside the moral boundaries of human nature.⁹

The conclusions which follow from this analysis are these: (1) evil does not originate in free will, *i.e.*, evil in its origin is not resident in human nature itself; (2) nor may evil be attributed to God—far be it!; (3) the origin of evil lies *along those relations which obtain between the objective world and human consciousness*; (4) evil as a force of temptation consists of all those ill-defined and subtle suggestions which are generated through experience, *i.e.*, derived out of existence itself; (5) the manifold impressions, allied more or less with ideas and improperly incorporated in the organism *i.e.*, badly digested intellectually, work out unsuccessfully in results detrimental to life. In a word, for the "subtle serpent" we substitute the abstract notion of material suggestion or physical stimuli.

Therefore the source of evil is identical with the source of good: both arise out of the conditions of existence.

⁶ This is indicated by representing woman as the first to yield since the feminine nature is more finely sensitive to suggestion. Of course woman as woman is no more the initial sinner than man.

⁷ Thus sins always bear a relation to evil which they presuppose, whether the evil be actual or merely potential. Absolute sin, or sin independent of evil, is an unreality.

⁸ *E.g.*, indigestion.

⁹ *I.e.*, unless we broaden our ethics so that morality will not be confined to the "moral nature" as classically delimited. See in this regard the art. by D. S. Miller in this REVIEW, Vol. I, No. 2.

REVIEWS

The Passion and Exaltation of Christ. By the Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D. Longmans, New York, 1918, pp. xx, 323. \$2.00

In this seventh volume of Dr. Hall's Summa, we have a welcome addition to the historic theology, of which the pivots are the events of Good Friday and Easter. The well-known merits of Dr. Hall's workmanship are again evident in his presentation of these most intricate problems of technical theological scholarship, *viz.*, the death of Christ, His resurrection and ascension, and the Heavenly Priesthood.

In the first chapter there is a rapid historical survey of various classic doctrines of the Atonement, and in the two succeeding chapters, an attempt is made to get a set of clear concepts after a careful exclusion of false and confused expressions and theories. Then follows the positive theology of the death and the descent into Hades. Nothing could be more stimulating than Dr. Hall's ruling out one by one of hypotheses, theories, and even long-cherished and widely-honored doctrines, which militate against the virility of our Lord's action on Calvary. Thus it is pointed out that there can be no forensic imputation (p. 45), no penal substitution (p. 48), no opposition between the love and the justice of God (p. 52), and no idea of predestination such that the sufficiency for all men of Christ's death is in any way limited (p. 54). This admirable grip on modern difficulties about much of the Atonement presentation is tersely expressed in summary (p. 55): "Every form of non-moral arbitrariness is foreign to the teaching of God's self-manifestation."

In Chapters six, seven, and eight, come the fact of the resurrection, the resultant theology, and rival theories. The positive theology of the resurrection could hardly be more lucidly and finely enunciated as, on the one hand, the key to

the significance of the death, and on the other, the life-impulse to all subsequent sacramental action. "The death of Christ constituted the historic form and means of redemption, but did this only as issuing in victory over death by His resurrection in the fulness of our nature from the tomb. The resurrection, then, is the mystery by which our Lord's redemptive death is made effective. And the victory over death which it completes also transfigures the human instrument of our Lord's sacrifice for sin, and converts it into a living, sacramental and abiding memorial of this sacrifice. Thus the resurrection enables the sacrifice which was made on the Cross to live on in a permanent and saving priesthood, and to serve as its abiding consecration" (p. 251). Would that many High Church manuals of devotion did appreciate this!

In recent years, there has come in many quarters a conviction that the resurrection, if it is to be believed in at all, must cease to be apologized for and have its importance minimized, and that it must become for present-day Christians what it was for the primitive Church, *viz.*, the very keystone of the whole Christian *Weltanschauung* ("If Christ be not raised," etc.). This thought is strongly enunciated by Dr. Hall: "The modernist regards the miracle of the resurrection as an obstacle to faith, because he regards it exclusively in relation to the natural course of events. The traditional Christian, on the other hand finds it to be the primary support of his belief in Jesus Christ, because he views it in relation to the redemptive drama and self-manifestation of the eternal Son of God, of which it is a vital part and the illuminative climax" (p. 243-244).

With such clear presentation of the resurrection, it is natural to find an equally suggestive treatment of the Heavenly Priesthood. Many of the wellworn sixteenth century controversies, with their attractiveness to certain contemporary Anglicans, simply dissolve into words before such a balanced statement as to the Eucharistic offering, as we

find on p. 312. "If our offering of the sacrifice is repeated, the sacrifice which we offer is not. It is that which the Cross made and perfected and which lives on forever." And very beautifully does Dr. Hall say in conclusion (p. 323): "The heavenly oblation is the abiding token above of what was done on Calvary, and the Eucharistic sacrifice is the recurring earthly celebration of that mystery. Earthly priests minister only as agents of Christ, and He is the real Priest and Oblation in every Eucharist."

There is one factor in the method of this volume which deviates from that in the earlier volumes. Dr. Hall states it at the start. "The author has been forced to pay attention to the apologetical aspects of his subjects" (p. ix). It is certainly true that there is proportionally much more of non-dogmatic material (apologetics and New Testament exegesis) than in the previous treatises. This will appeal to readers differently according to their interest. It has the distinct advantage that it brings up, argues with, and frequently disposes of suggestions, explanations, and interpretations which sometimes and somewhere have been raised in connection with the dogmas in question. Yet it may seem to some minds that however interesting, much of this is *not* dogmatic theology, and many who would agree *ex animo* with the dogmatics of this volume may see difficulties in its excursus into other disciplines. For example, on p. 156 we read: "That His body was real, that locality is a necessary condition of body, and that our Lord plainly meant to indicate by His visible movement a local withdrawal to some invisible region, seems too clear for dispute except by those who deny the facts given in the Gospel narratives of our Lord's post-resurrection appearances." Now quite apart from the question of fact in the last clause, it is not too much to say that there is not one of the above statements which is not highly questionable from a philosophical standpoint (Descartes, Kant, Bergson, and the New Realists), and this on the part of those who would be most enthusiastic for

the purely dogmatic statement on the very next page (157): "Heaven is where our Lord's glorified body is, and Hell is where the devil and lost spirits are." When Dr. Hall himself adds after the above sentence. "Beyond this we cannot go," the present reviewer can only say Amen, and why try?

LEICESTER C. LEWIS

The Experience of God in Modern Life. By Eugene William Lyman, D.D. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1918.

Prof. Lyman's book offers two contributions, both of value, and they are fitly commingled in his pages. The first is a consecutive argument for the existence of God conceived as an *Eternal Creative Good Will*. The second is the impressive preaching of a moral ideal in relation to (1) individual personality, (2) social progress, and (3) our attitude toward the universe. The two contributions, though distinguishable, are logically connected. It is because the faith in God, conceived as thus described, powerfully forwards our moral progress as thus preached that the author holds us entitled to believe in His existence.

According to the argument we are to recognize the peculiar value of faith in God and from this to infer that He exists. The three chapters point out this value in three spheres. (1) "The religion that promises most for the development of personality is an experience of being *co-workers with an Eternal Creative Good Will*; . . . not a God who once was the author of creation or of a plan of salvation, but a God who all through the time-process and at this present moment is creating new facts and new values, and whose moral energies are ceaselessly going forth to eliminate evil from the world and to organize every bit of mind that exists into a spiritual universe." "This experience involves a conception of man as revealing, when he rises to the heights of moral creativity, the deepest mystery of existence, and as capable of being a sharer in the creative and redemptive work of

God." The author sets forth the experiences of Bushnell, Martineau, Ritschl and Tolstoy as illustrating this remark. "God is felt or believed to be a present fact of the inner life in proportion as creative moral energy is rising and maintaining itself within. The marks of his presence are moral renewal, new increments of moral insight and power, the ceaselessly growing moral life." But yet in such experiences God is not thought of as identical with the moral renewal itself but as a superhuman moral power, a Being without whom the moral renewal would not take place. The consciousness of God and experience of moral renewal are mingled. "One has an experience of co-working with an Eternal Creative Good Will." Now the validity or truth of every religious idea is to be tested by its capacity to gather one's interest about it and become a creative moral power in the right direction.

Parallel is the argument in the second chapter in regard to social progress. "The verification of the faith in an Eternal Creative Good Will which comes through the development of personality is necessarily only partial and points on to social experience as the realm where it can be made more nearly complete." "In showing the high social value of the consciousness of co-working with God, we have established a reasonable presumption of the reality of God and have furnished for that presumption important positive proof." To see this high social value we must once more be on our guard against the conception of religion which bids us resign the cause of social progress, leaving it wholly to God saying "It will all come out right," "Thy will be done." No, we must conceive of God as working through us, of ourselves as working with Him in a social advance that is only to be accomplished by our effort. Moreover, we must turn from an aristocratic, deterministic, nationalistic ethics to "the ethics of democracy, of moral freedom, and of internationalism."

Coming, with the third and final chapter, to the relation

of the matter to cosmic evolution, the author finds that the same creative moral tendency that appears in personal life and in social life, appears in the whole cosmic process of things. "The reality of a Central Mind is a sound working-hypothesis for the interpretation of evolution, that gives support to the religious experience of co-working with an Eternal Creative Good Will." In view of the evil in the world we must recognize the Central Mind to be working under limiting conditions. But these limiting conditions are inherent in the nature of the world-purpose, being conditions on which the realization of that purpose depends. Without the faith in such a cosmic purpose, the indications of astronomy, physics, etc., that all life is destined to cease would have a depressing effect upon social progress. Only the faith in a God "who is eternal by reason of the inexhaustibleness of his creative love" releases to the utmost the energies of moral progress.

This is a bare inadequate summary of the three steps of argument which are really three applications of one argument. As to the force of that argument itself one is not suggesting any fault peculiar to Dr. Lyman's book if one observes that we should see better what the thought is if it were in simpler words. If you say that the philosophy of religion must take values into account as well as facts we are ready to accept the statement, not knowing exactly what it means. But if you say that something must be true because we want it to be true, or because it is very useful to believe in it, then we understand better and accept less. "Any thorough-going organization of experience will have to include values as well as facts." What is meant by organization of "experience"? What is meant by "values"? Above all what is meant by "include"? In the sentence above the organization of experience has to "include values." In another place (page 47), the value of religious ideas appears to be equivalent to "capacity to organize experience." "Organizing experience," seems now to be something that philosophy

does, and anon something that religious faith working practically in life does. To the uninitiated a philosophic vocabulary seems a difficult thing apparently required for arduous processes of thought. But again we are not speaking of anything peculiar to Dr. Lyman's work if we say that such a vocabulary is for the adept a far more easy and unresisting medium in which to float and glide forward on a vague current of suggestion than the homeliest words. The same applies to the treatment of the problem of evil in the last chapter. We avoid the difficulty without knowing it by changing the language.

This is not to intimate that Dr. Lyman's argument is without foundation. On the contrary, that the idea of God has power in the human soul is in the reviewer's belief the basis of an indestructible argument. The more we look realities narrowly in the face, the more potent that argument becomes and the more its exact nature is brought out. The phrases of the philosophy now in fashion sometimes, as here, merely veil or swathe—an invaluable thought to its own disadvantage. The book is timely and by its spirit as well as its thought likely to do good service.

DICKINSON S. MILLER

Plotinos. Complete Works in Chronological Order, Grouped in Four Periods; Biography by Porphyry, Eunapius, & Suidas, Commentary by Porphyry, Illustrations by Jamblichus & Ammocius, Studies in Sources, Development, Influence; Index of Subjects, Thoughts and Words. 4 vols. By Kenneth Sylvan Guthrie Ph.D., M.D. Comparative Literature Press, Alpine, New Jersey, 1918. \$12.00.

Just what connection Neo-Platonism has had with the Great War may not be obvious, yet that there has recently been a marked revival of interest in this third century mystical science is certain. As the theme for the Gifford Lectures at St. Andrews of 1917-18, Dean Inge selected the *Philosophy of Plotinus*, while from M. Picavet, the veteran Parisian mediaevalist, has just appeared a most suggestive introduction to the study of Christian thought in the third century,

Hypostases Plotiniennes et Trinité chrétienne. Now to the credit of the American Church, we have from one of our own priests a full and authoritative *Plotiniana*—all the works carefully translated together with pertinent contemporary interpretation of, and commentary upon, the great Neo-Platonist saint.

Any adequate exposition of the more than 1400 pages of this monumental work would develop a treatise, yet there are two convictions which must come strongly to the student of Dr. Guthrie's labor. The first is the lack of ballast in all Neo-Platonic speculation because of the absence of a foundation in the Incarnation. There is nothing for the magnificent system to grip upon, no hard historical data, and hence there is ever in it an irritating artificiality on the one hand, and an emotional unwholesomeness on the other.

The second lesson, patent to all, must be the alertness of the Early Church to seize upon and to extensively profit by the best secular thought of its time. That Origen and the entire Alexandrian School leading up to St. Athanasius were saturated in Neo-Platonism as *the* science of the day, and that they eagerly adopted this "modern thought" of their time as the most efficient means of expressing Catholic truth, this far reaching proposition is now in the English presentation of Plotinus accessible to all. With St. Athanasius as the secularizing modernist of the fourth century, and St. Thomas the radical and condemned innovator of the thirteenth, the valorous standpatism of certain Anglican and Roman circles appears as anything but Catholic.

Dr. Guthrie has placed the whole English theological world in his debt. His work is one which no theological or philosophical library can afford to be without.

LEICESTER C. LEWIS

The Old Testament. By Loring W. Batten. University of the South Press, Sewanee, 1917, pp. 304. \$1.50.

This is a well-balanced, sane, and careful study in the books of the Old Testament. As a brief and reliable introduction

to the several books, it leaves little to be desired. It does not, however, appear to the reviewer quite to satisfy the requirements of the series of which it is a part. It is supposed to be recommendable to candidates for Holy Orders. But there are many phases of Old Testament study, of which candidates are expected to know something, which are not treated at all in this book. The subjects of Old Testament history, religion, and ethics are scarcely broached. A word would be expected on revelation, inspiration and archaeology. But perhaps the author himself did not write primarily for candidates for Holy Orders. In this case, while fault may be found with some points of system and order in treatment, such as the unchronological arrangement of the prophets, and the scattered discussion of the sources, the book is well worth while and is to be recommended to students who desire a simpler and more readable discussion of the books of the Old Testament than can be found in Driver's standard work. A similar book should now be prepared covering the inter-testamental literature.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

The War and the Bible. By H. G. Enelow. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918, pp. 115.

This little book is written by a Jewish rabbi, who is a leader in religious thought, and has served his country at the Paris Headquarters of the Jewish Welfare Board. It is one of the best books which this great crisis has produced. Dr. Enelow's subject is the aspects of war in the Bible. Taking the Old Testament, he discusses its attitude toward war, its war-ethics, war-heroes, war-poetry, war-prayers, its parallels to the Great War, and its peace ideals. Beautifully written and clearly presented, the author shows how war refined Israel, and how Israel refined war; he shows how the Bible recognizes the necessity of war under certain conditions, though it is dominated by the ideal of peace; how it differentiates between noble and ignoble wars; and how it affirms the value of war as an ethical corrective and a means of spiritual

purification. Yet the book is not belligerent. It is sane, well-balanced, full of the poetic spirit, and comparable to the best which Christian writers have produced upon the subject. Would that the New Israel understood the Old as well as Dr. Enelow understands the spirit of them both!

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Menno Simons. His Life, Labors, and Teachings. By John Horsch. Mennonite Publishing House, Scottdale, Pa. 1916, 324 pp.

It is of value to have in English a really authoritative life of the great Dutch radical of the Reformation. We are so accustomed to hear only of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, that we frequently forget that there was a large part of the Reformation movement bitterly hostile to the so-called "orthodox" reformers. For Menno Simons and his many followers, Luther and his confreres were hardly better than the Pope with his Cardinals.

The author seems to have saturated himself both as to thought and expression in the writings of his hero, and there can be little doubt but that the Mennonites have been more loyal than the members of other Communions to their own "Reformation Settlement." If historical criticism ever succeeds in getting a foothold in Mennonitism it will probably introduce here, as it has in other groups, first confusion and then progress.

LEICESTER C. LEWIS

Pastor Halloft, A Story of Clerical Life. Longmans, Green, and Co., New York, 1918, 291 pp. \$1.50 net.

This book consists of short chapters from a priest's life, in each of which the power of an intelligent and devoted priesthood is exhibited amid perplexing yet quite conventional circumstances. From his ordination to death, scenes are given in the priestly experience of "Pastor Halloft," such as "First Mistakes," "The School," "Christmas Diversions," "The New Curate," etc. The volume is an admirable addition to the literature of Pastoral Theology, and, while written

strictly from the Roman Catholic standpoint, cannot fail to be of inspiration to any type of sincere pastor.

LEICESTER C. LEWIS

The Coming of the Lord: Will It Be Premillennial? By James H. Snowden. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1919, pp. xxi, 288. \$1.75.

A good old-fashioned treatment of dogmatic eschatology, handled in the good old-fashioned way; the author sets himself to prove not only that the postmillennial view is true, but that it is set forth explicitly in the Bible, and that the Bible knows no other doctrine. He has read (and cites) many modern works, but they have not at all convinced him that his dogmatic method needs correction in any way. The value of such a work lies in its use as an *ad hominem* argument for eschatological sanity, although it will scarcely convince any premillenarianist who argues from the same hermenteutic principles.

The lavish citations from premillenarian writers form a superb museum of exegetical pathology.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

Johannine Writings. By A. Nairne. Longmans, Green and Co., London and New York, 1918, pp. 114. 90c.

A pleasantly written little manual, with explicit apologetic interests. The scholarship is adequate, and its adequacy perhaps appears best in the generally inconclusive tone with which critical difficulties are handled; Dr. Nairne knows the Johannine problem too well to be dogmatic in either direction. But is this the best apologetic method? Many readers will feel that over and over again they are being put off with a cloud of words. It surely would have been preferable to concentrate on the points on which there is general agreement, to show the proper method of treatment, and to indicate how this can be extended in the more dubious cases.

On p. 41 the Logos is defined pointblank as "Reason," with no indication that an entirely different sense ("Creative Power") is widely defended.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The victory of the Allied troops in Palestine has opened up new fields for archaeological work. The Palestine Exploration Fund and the British Academy have already formed a joint committee for a British School of Archaeology in Palestine. Mrs. Nies, wife of the Rev. Dr. James Nies has made a most generous gift of \$50,000 to the American School of Archaeology in Jerusalem. But this is only the beginning of what America should do for Biblical research. Professor Petrie, the veteran archaeologist recently said, "by far the most satisfactory thing would be to establish a new business town a mile or two out from Jerusalem and gradually clear the historic city. . . . The whole of Jerusalem is only a quarter of a square mile, and the city is totally unfit for a business city. It has a bad access and bad water, and is soaked with sewage. The first thing to be done is to get it as clear as we can of human habitation, and preserve it as a sanctuary for the three faiths—Jewish, Christian and Moslem." The American School is situated outside the walls of the city. *M.*

Dr. Paul Carus died in January. Born in Germany in 1852, he took his doctorate at Tuebingen in 1876, and came to this country shortly afterward. He was the author of many works in philosophy, ethics, and theology, and an eager student of Buddhism. His widest influence was exercised through the two journals of which he was editor, *The Open Court* and *The Monist*. *L.*

The summer school at Hobart College, Geneva, New York, will be held again this summer, June 30 to July 11. Full information can be had from Mrs. G. H. Lewis, New Paltz, New York. *M.*

THE WITNESS

A NATIONAL WEEKLY CHURCH NEWSPAPER

for the people, intended to be instructive and devotional rather than controversial. A plain paper aiming to reach the plain man with plain facts, unbiased by partisan and sectional views. \$1.00 a year.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Bishop IRVING P. JOHNSON, Editor-in-Chief

Bishop JOHN C. SAGE, Associate Editor

The Rev. CHARLES J. SHUTT, Managing Editor,
6219 Cottage Grove Avenue, Chicago

The Rev. L. W. APPLEGATE, Hobart, Indiana, Business Manager

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

The Rev. GEORGE P. ATWATER

Mrs. GRACE W. JOHNSON

Bishop HENRY J. MIKELL

The Rev. FRANCIS S. WHITE

The Rev. JAMES SHEERIN

Bishop JAMES WISE

ADVERTISING RATES

Three dollars an inch each insertion

All advertisements next to reading matter

DISCOUNTS

Ten per cent. for three months; fifteen per cent. for six months;
twenty per cent. for twelve months

Mail a postal card request to the Business Manager for our plan to place every family in a parish or mission on the regular subscription list, and for our proposition to make *The Witness* a Diocesan or Parish paper.

Address all business communications to the

BUSINESS MANAGER Hobart, Indiana

Address all exchanges and articles for publication to the

MANAGING EDITOR . 6219 Cottage Grove Avenue, Chicago

